

The Sword of Saint Peter: Jeremy Collier and the Development of Non-Juror
Ecclesiology, 1662-1696

By

J.C. Parks

A Thesis

Presented to the Graduate and Research Committee

of Lehigh University

in Candidacy for the Degree of

Master of Arts

in

History

Lehigh University

8/26/2018

Copyright
J.C. Parks

Thesis is accepted and approved in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts in the History Department

“The Sword of Saint Peter: Jeremy Collier and the Development of Non-Juror Ecclesiology, 1662-1696”
J.C. Parks

Date Approved

William J. Bulman
Advisor

Michelle LeMaster
Co-Advisor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	1
Works Cited	61
Curriculum Vitae	65

Abstract:

This study explores the seventeenth century Non-Jurors and their distinct ecclesiastical vision and polity through the career of Jeremy Collier. Rather than doctrinaire High Churchmen or Jacobites in disguise, the Non-Jurors carried their preexisting high view of episcopacy to an attack upon the royal supremacy over the Church of England. By examining the Absolution Controversy of 1696, and the preceding polemics between leading Non-Jurors and conforming churchmen (Stillington and Sherlock), this study argues that the Non-Juror movement offered a radical challenge to both so-called Latitudinarians and High Churchmen. As an ordained presbyter, Jeremy Collier asserted that the Church of England, including its government and liturgy, was a wholly separate institution from both parliament and the crown. The Non-Jurors provide a window onto the political and ecclesiastical struggles that continued from the Restoration into the revolutionary settlement of 1688, exploring how the concept of separation between Church and state developed.

On April 13, 1696 two men died. Sir William Perkins and Sir John Friend were tried, convicted, and executed for a conspiracy to murder William III. The Assassination Plot of 1696 intended to reverse the Glorious Revolution, spurring a French army to land on English soil and reinstate James II at the death of the Dutch king. While Friend and Perkins played a minor role in the plot, they were among the few who were in custody. Seeking to capitalize on the coup's failure, the government speedily sentenced the two plotters to death. Supporters of William celebrated, claiming that God had providentially saved England from her enemies.¹ However, three others stood with Friend and Perkins. Jeremy Collier, alongside his brother priests, Shadrach Cook and William Snatt, placed their hands on the condemned and prayed over them. Loudly before an onlooking crowd, Collier and his brother priests publicly pronounced that God had absolved these traitors of all their sins. All five of these men, both the three ordained presbyters and two lay congregants, were members of the Non-Jurors, claimants to the true Church of England. The absolution set off a controversy, involving official sanction from both the conforming churchmen and William's government. Bishops censured the Non-Jurors as heterodox, attempting to pollute the Church with Roman Catholic doctrines. Magistrates charged the priests with High Misdemeanor, issuing warrants for their arrest. Both authorities rebuked the absolving priests as a threat to the English church and state. Jeremy Collier went into hiding, taking up his pen to defend his actions. Justifying his actions, Collier cast a vision of the Church of England that challenged not only the revolutionary settlement, but the future of the English Church-state, at its core.

¹ For a more detailed account of the events surrounding the plot and its aftermath, see Jane Garrett, *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696* (Cambridge University Press, 1980).

The Absolution Controversy was a battle over the independence of the Church within English society. As Collier argued his case, he battled for a Church of England that was a spiritually autonomous society, possessing powers and offices that the civil magistrate, even the king, could not regulate. Non-Jurors resisted William's right to meddle in the affairs of the Church. In 1691, William deprived ministers of their office if they would not swear a new oath to him. He then appointed men to fill the newly vacant offices. Between those who swore the oath and those who did not, the Church of England entered a state of schism. While the oaths sparked the separation, it was a distinct and opposed vision of the Church that maintained division between Non-Jurors and their conforming brethren. While the conforming Church defended William's right to strip offices in theory, with varying degrees of support for its practice in 1691, Non-Jurors refused the king's right. The Church, they argued, constituted through rightly elected bishops, governed itself. No layman, not even the crown, could direct or determine the government of Christ's society. Departing radically from conforming churchmen, the Absolution Controversy provided the creative friction for Collier to articulate a vision of the Church of England without the royal supremacy.

This essay situates the Absolution Controversy within the greater Non-Juror movement. Collier defended his actions from his conviction that the Church of England was an autonomous, but wholly spiritual, society. The division within the Church of England radicalized this commitment to ecclesiastical independence, a concept that began to be articulated before the Glorious Revolution. These churchmen believed that since the Church had a divine origin and purpose, unlike the state, its needs took precedence. While the Church and civil government could have a working partnership, they were

always separable in practice. In times of crisis, the Church's duty was to separate from the grasping powers of the magistrate. Since William had illicitly intervened in ecclesiastical affairs, all churchmen who supported these royal actions were schismatics. For the Non-Jurors, the line had been crossed. Possibility of separation became an actuality. As the schism continued, Non-Juror churchmen pressed the theory of separability into an active call to separate. The conforming Church was now considered an illicit body, having rejected the rights of duly elected ministers, and a creature of the state. Non-Jurors pressed their convictions to the edge, arguing for a clean break between the Church and state. Collier's absolution became a visible demonstration of these principles at work. The controversy pushed both sides, Non-Juror and conforming, to define an ecclesiology within the heady, post-revolution, 1690s.

This essay weighs in on what the Non-Jurors' ecclesiology was, and how it fits within the broader historiography of the later Stuart Church of England. One approach is to see the Non-Jurors as heirs to an "Anglo-Catholic" strand of Anglican theology, a precursor to the Tractarians and the Oxford Movement. L.M. Hawkins, exemplar of this school of thought, argues that the Non-Jurors were principled proponents of the spiritual autonomy of the Church. The Non-Jurors were not politically motivated and were generally disinterested in Jacobitism. Politics were incidental to piety. Thus, the major point of contention was not the oath, but the deprivations of the clergy. The Non-Jurors were "Laudian", supporting the Church's supremacy in society, while rejecting an "avowedly Protestant" conforming Church. According to Hawkins, Non-Jurors' convictions were subversive, destabilizing the monarch's supremacy over the Church. However, in all the conflict, the Non-Jurors wrote "nothing new." Hawkins portrays the

schism as an intramural battle of ideas, where an “unrestrained Catholic” impulse warred against Erastian elements.²

In contrast to this view, another interpretation is that the Non-Juror schism was purely politics. The main point of contention was the oath, which the Non-Jurors refused to swear because of conscience. The schism was a political one dressed up as an ecclesiological one, all sides agreeing to passive obedience and divine right of kings. The Non-Jurors were members of good standing within the High Church, and distinctly Tory, faction. Unlike conforming High Churchmen, the Non-Jurors could not reconcile themselves to the Revolution, remaining loyal to James. They were still united with the High Churchmen in spirit, if not institutionally, and worked together to resist the Whig dominance under William. As an example of this approach, J.C. Wand argued that the Non-Jurors wholly embraced the Elizabethan settlement of the Church, accepting the divine right of the monarch over the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The schism was “purely political”, only strictly involving the oath and state prayers to William and Mary. Being mostly scholars, these “bright lights” left the conforming High Church party vulnerable to Latitudinarian dominance. The Non-Jurors remained kindred with the High-Church party until the death of Non-Juror bishop Thomas Ken (died 1711), who represented the “moderate” wing among the schismatics. Wand notes remorsefully that when George

² L.M. Hawkins, *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution* (London: Routledge, 1928), 49; 53-55; 119-124. Hawkins draws upon the much more biographical work of Canon Overton, who had drawn similar conclusions. See J. H. Overton, *The Non-Jurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings* (London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1902), 6-8. Other commentary, focusing on the conforming Church of England, follows a similar idealization. See John Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991), 378-379. Tony Claydon, *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760* (Cambridge University Press, 2007), 288-289; 312; 333-334; 353. Craig Rose, *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War* (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999), 182.

Hickes assumed leadership in 1711, he pushed the movement towards greater radicalism. For Wand, what was once a temporary division became permanent separation.³

The pure politics position has come in a variety of shades, offering additional nuances. G.V. Bennett argues against viewing the Glorious Revolution as Latitudinarian ascendancy, while maintaining the shared ecclesiology between the Non-Jurors and the High Church party. William was an adept churchman, and he staffed his episcopal bench with both court-Whig and moderate Tory churchmen. These bishops supported William's government, and its muted shift away from Restoration-era ecclesiology. Unlike their conforming brethren, the Non-Jurors had not compromised on the monarch's divine right, or the Church's passive obedience, to the crown. As a "ghost of the past", the Non-Jurors discredited the Tory position until the reign of Anne. The 1690s saw a gridlock for the conforming Church, riveted by factions. Caught between William's episcopal bench and an increasingly "Country Tory" lower clergy, the Church froze. The Non-Jurors remained an embarrassment but were otherwise a reactionary Jacobite wing of the High Church party.⁴

³ J.C. Wand, *The High Church Schism* (London: The Faith Press, 1951), 3-5; 11-12; 16-18. Following Wand's thesis, the most recent works of historical theology consider the High Church and the Non-Jurors as virtually synonymous. See Robert D. Cornwall, *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought* (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993), 11-16; 60-77. Kenneth Hylson-Smith, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 71-77. Kenneth A. Locke, *The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009), 67-71.

⁴ G.V. Bennett, "Conflict in the Church", in *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, ed. Geoffrey Holmes (Bungay, Suffolk: Macmillan and Co., 1969), 159-160; 165-166. G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975), vii-viii; 4; 10-13; 20-22. For a broader view of the politics surrounding the Church of England and state in the 1690s that shares Bennett's assessment, see Henry Horwitz, *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III* (Manchester University Press, 1977), 1-2; 53; 78; 199; Gordon Rupp, *Religion in England, 1688-1791* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986), 5; 72-75.

John Findon, a student of Bennett's, argues along similar lines, though with far more attention to the Non-Jurors and their ecclesiastical structure. The revolutionary settlement in 1689 discredited Anglican political theology, defined as the monarch's divine right and the Church's passive obedience. The new oaths forced apart the High Church faction, resulting in developments on each side. The conforming High Church adopted William Sherlock's defense of the Revolution as providence *simpliciter*. God removed James from the throne and placed William on it, with proof in the fact that it had occurred. This position justified the new oaths, as well as defending traditional political theology. The Non-Jurors began to follow Henry Dodwell's extreme positions on the Church, seeing it as an autonomous and independent spiritual society. A Dodwellian ecclesiology altered the principles of the Non-Jurors, shifting the focus from the new oaths to the deprivation of the clergy. Non-Jurors, fearing Sherlock's "Hobbist" argument, as well as rising anti-clericalism, radicalized further along Dodwellian lines. The Non-Juror schism began as a political fissure, but developed into a full-blown ecclesiastical revolt.⁵

In contrast to positing a growing divide between conforming High Churchmen and the Non-Jurors, Brent Sirota argues for the former's increasing dependence on the latter. Like Bennett above, the succession of William thoroughly discredited High Church

⁵ John C. Findon, "The NonJurors and the Church of England, 1689-1716" (DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 1976), 92-93; 1267-127; 138-142; 170-175; 184-186. Jacqueline Rose's work shines additional light on how the doctrine of divine right was foundation for debates within the Church of England. See Jacqueline Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660-1668* (Cambridge University Press, 2011), 2; 5; 245; 279. Jacqueline Rose, "'By law established': The Church of England and the royal supremacy" in *The later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, ed. Grant Tapsell (Manchester University Press, 2012), 23; 25-26; 32-33. For a further analysis of Dodwell's ecclesiology and theological method in justifying it, see Jean-Louis Quantin, *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century* (Oxford University Press, 2009), 342-343; 381-390.

Tories. William's episcopal choices favored Latitude men and Whigs, amplifying an increasingly dominant ecclesiology of voluntary association. Rising stars within William's Church, such as Burnet, Stillingfleet, and Tillotson, supported this platform. In contrast, the High Church party attempted to counter with arguments for an autonomous, spiritual church with a sacerdotal priesthood. In other words, High Churchmen utilized the Non-Juror's view of the Church to resist the rising tides of modernity. For Sirota, dependence on the Non-Jurors left the High Church party "speaking a dying, if not quite dead, language." The faction collapsed with the failed bid for power in the Convocation Controversy of 1702. This twilight was also the end for the Non-Jurors as a viable ecclesiology. The Church had solidly embraced voluntary associations. A new era had begun.⁶

In marked contrast to the above views, George Every conceptualizes factions in the Church along the axis of discipline. At its rebirth in 1662, the Church was bereft of institutional reforms to effect discipline. Every argues that, prior to the Glorious Revolution, there was no High Church party. However, "high" ecclesiology existed, defined as any position that sought more power for the Church than the Restoration had

⁶ Brent S. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 3-4; 24-25; 70-71 151-153; 188-190. Brent S. Sirota, "The Trinitarian Crisis in Church and State: Religious Controversy and the Making of the Post-revolutionary Church of England, 1687-1702," *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 52, (January 2013), 26; 28-29; 53-54. Brent S. Sirota, "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered': The Convocation Controversy, and Anglican High Churchmanship, 1689-1702" in *Religion and the State: Europe and North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, eds. Joshua B. Stein and Sargon G. Donabed (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012), 44-46; 50. Sirota's approach to the Non-Jurors' relationship to the conforming High Church party follows Mark Goldie's argument in content, though disagreeing with his Revisionist assessment of the Glorious Revolution as a whole. Sirota specifically depends upon Guy Martin Yould's work for specifics about the Non-Jurors within the development of the High Church party. See Guy Martin Yould, "The Origins and Transformation of the Non-Juror Schism, 1670-1715; Illustrated by Special Reference to the Career, Writings and Activities of Dr. George Hickes, 1642-1715" (DPhil thesis, University of Hull, 1979). Mark Goldie, "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy" in *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, ed. Eveline Cruickshanks (Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982), 15; 28; 29-30.

granted it. It was not a specific platform. “High” churchmen fought to use the full-authority of the Church for disciplinary measures, though they were divided on what reforms were necessary to bring about this empowerment. Dodwell was among those who argued for spiritual independency to exercise discipline within the Church. This position ran up against both Whig and Tory churchmen who resisted the use of ecclesiastical discipline. At first, the Glorious Revolution did not disturb these interests. Many future High Churchmen were part of William’s initial episcopal bench. Rather, the failure of comprehension and the lapse in censorship brought about a crisis for the Church. It was the growth of Dissenters and unorthodox literature that provoked the cry of Church in danger. Under the popular leadership of Francis Atterbury, the High Church Tories sought to prevent decline in the Church through the coercive powers of the state, reaching its zenith under Anne’s reign. Unlike Dodwell, the High Churchmen argued that the Church has its power through the monarch’s legal establishment of it, even going as far as drawing a parallel between the Church’s convocation and Parliament. The High Church party sought an increase in discipline, but a discipline tethered to the arm of the state. In contrast, the Non-Jurors continued to agitate for an independent Church, blaming the state’s meddling for immorality and laxity within the flock. Rather than becoming defunct, Non-Juror interests overlapped with both Latitudinarians and High Churchmen suspicious of wedding the Church too closely to the crown.⁷

This essay utilizes Every’s focus on discipline as a practice the divided churchmen as a broader model for ecclesiastical practice. The Church’s liturgy and

⁷ George Every, *The High Church Party, 1688-1718* (London: SPCK, 1956), xiii-xiv; 1; 72-73; 82-93; 103-104.

pastoral offices were, in a sense, ideas in motion. Keeping ecclesiology and ecclesiastic practice together opens up a better vantage for analysis. Rather than seeing the High Church and the Non-Jurors as reflections of one another, this paper argues that the Non-Jurors had a distinct origin. Not only did the High Church party not exist when the schism occurred, the Non-Jurors emerged from a different set of commitments and principles that formed during the Restoration period. Uneasy about the power balance between the Church and the crown, some churchmen began to use patristic studies to formulate a more radical ecclesiological platform than what was on offer. While the future High Church party, along with Latitude-men, maintained Constantine as a normative example for king's role in the Church, those who became the Non-Jurors did not. Instead, they looked for an ecclesiology before the first Christian emperor to ground the Church. These malcontents emphasized the disjuncture between the Church, represented most fully in the communion of its bishops, and the English state, whether king or king-in-Parliament. St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage in the third century, became a symbol of this distinct ecclesiological account of the Church of England. This Cyprianic schema⁸ became the theological backbone for Non-Juror resistance. While the new oaths provoked a tumult in the Church, it was a difference of principles that sustained the schism. Dodwell, Hickes, and, as this paper will primarily focus on, Collier turned the crisis of oaths and deprivation into a revolt. The Non-Jurors were committed to a self-

⁸ Cyprianic schema refers to St. Cyprian's view of the Church Catholic as the unity of its bishops. Thus, to be a Christian is to be properly related to the local bishop who is in communion with all other bishops, who together authoritatively represent the Church Catholic under Jesus Christ. The use of 'schema' draws upon the work of William H. Sewell, where a schema is a governing idea utilized to interpret other events. According to Sewell, when a schema combines with resources, whether tangible or intangible (e.g. the office of the priest), there is a functioning structure exerting some level of influence. In this case, the Non-Juror Church is such a structure. See William H. Sewell Jr., *The Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 2005), 131-133; 136-137; 140-143; 145-146.

regulating Church which could pastor and discipline Christians without tarrying for the state. They Non-Jurors believed the alliance between Aaron and Moses, between the Church and State, a pipe dream. Thus, the separation was not merely an accident of politics, but conviction over the future of the Church. The Non-Jurors were not the rump loyal to the house of Stuart, nor did they profit from the conflict. To the contrary, becoming a Non-Juror was materially disastrous for those involved, as they were stripped of civilly recognized office and its financial benefits. When confronted with lay encroachments, whether from crown or gentry, the Non-Jurors chose separation over compromise. The Church was an autonomous, independent, spiritual power, established by its head, Jesus Christ, through the Apostles and continued through their successors, the bishops. If the state infringed upon this reality, the Church would sever all ties.

This essay focuses on Jeremy Collier as not only a model Non-Juror, but one that expanded the breadth of the movement. Scholarship on Collier has mostly focused on his eighteenth-century episcopal career within the shrinking, and increasingly fastidious, movement.⁹ From this vantage, Collier's radical views become a symptom of his insular sect, developed in separation from the main discourse of English ecclesiastical and political life. A rare example to the contrary is J. Hopes' work, but he focuses solely on Collier's political theory, detached from his ecclesiastical concerns.¹⁰ This paper will focus on Collier's earlier career, during which he developed his discontent through the

⁹ Henry Broxap, *The Later Non-Jurors* (Cambridge University Press, 1924); Andrew Starkie, "Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier," *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005), 335-351. For a full biography that treats Collier's earlier Non-Juror career, though insufficiently for the purposes of this essay, see Tania Boster, "Better to be alone than in ill company': Jeremy Collier the Younger: Life and Works, 1650-1726" (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2008).

¹⁰ J. Hopes, "Politics and Morality in the Writings of Jeremy Collier," *Literature and History* 8 (1978), 159-174.

Cyprianic schema. Contrary to claims that George Hickes radicalized the Non-Jurors in the late 1700s, I argue that Collier's career and writings reveal a longer and more principally radical movement beginning much earlier. Collier not only wrote apologetics for the Non-Jurors' principles, he put them into practice. The Absolution Controversy, and Collier's involvement in it, reveal the well-established battle lines between the Non-Juror view of the Church and its conforming critics. The nascent High Church party had no truck with Non-Jurors and their view of a separate Church within the commonwealth. In contrast to Sirota, Collier's defense of his absolution belied any similarity or overlap between "High Churchmen" and the Non-Jurors. Instead, Collier's conflict over the state-prayers offered to the monarch with William Sherlock, an exemplar high flier, reveals a deep and bitter difference over the Church's role in civil society. While members of the future High Church faction would argue that the Church as a separate organ of the Christian state, a counterpart to Parliament, the Non-Jurors evacuated all civil power from the Church. The spiritual monarchy of the bishops did not overlap, or oppose, the civil and secular authority of the king. This was no return to Laud or some timeless "Catholic" principle, but a developing theology of the Church which radicalized as the Williamite regime pressured it. In the 1690s, Collier represented a Non-Juror Church that threatened the future of the English church-state, provoking conforming churchmen of all stripes. The Non-Jurors remained a distinct, and much hated, alternative path for the Church of England.

The Non-Juror schism renewed the ambiguous relationship between the Restoration Church of England and the monarchy. In 1662, the Restoration brought the

Church of England back into existence, but Anglicans with a “high” view of the Church were not pleased. Reacting to the heady years of Puritan rule, Parliament reduced independent ministerial powers, folding ecclesiastical authority into the state. The Restoration saw the creation of a confessional-state, in which the Church served as much a political function as Parliament served a religious one. While most influential churchmen were comfortable with the Church’s restoration, a small and weak, but vocal, minority protested. These “high” Anglicans believed clunky ecclesiastical institutions were intentionally restored without amendment, leaving diocesan bishops incapable of exercising authority they had only in theory. With Parliament assuming more authority in deciding doctrine, the Cavalier Parliament seemed to make the Church an instrument of its will. During the reign of Charles II, they agitated within the confines of reestablishment. They argued that the ordained offices of the Church were *jure divino*, the hierarchy of a spiritual kingdom established by Jesus Christ himself. Its origins were different from any nation’s government, even if God established those as well. “High” Anglican clergy and scholars defended a vision of a Church that possessed an integrity beyond the confines of prince and Parliament.¹¹

St. Cyprian of Carthage’s life and work became a paradigm many “high” churchmen followed. Throughout the seventeenth century, apologists defended the Church from Roman Catholic and separatist critiques along patristic lines. Appeals to the “Fathers” were attempts to riposte critics, deflecting accusations that the Church of

¹¹ Every, 1; 8-10. Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England*, 18-19; 130. Norman Sykes, *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768* (Cambridge University Press, 1959), 1-5; 22. J.C.D. Clark, *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, ideology, and politics during the ancient regime*, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge University Press, 2000), 57-58. Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*, xiv-xvi; 151-161.

England was heretical, apostate, or corrupted through encrusted traditions. After the Restoration, “high” advocates for the Church, including Herbert Thorndike and Henry Dodwell, attempted to develop a paradigmatic use of the Fathers, beyond *ad hoc* apologetics. St. Cyprian became symbolic of a purer age, one where principles of ecclesiastical government were clear and undisputed. In the third century, the African bishop had successfully defended the spiritual authority of the episcopacy in the heat of the Novatian schism, an inter-ecclesial battle over an episcopal succession. According to “high” commentators, the Church Catholic had maintained the precedent ever since. This universal acceptance was more important than mere antiquity. For the sainted bishop, the Church was a spiritual kingdom, governed by its spiritual monarchs, the bishops, all united with one another under the sovereign headship of Jesus Christ. Thorndike and Dodwell formed this Cyprianic schema of the Church through their prolific scholarship, attracting disgruntled Anglicans with their firm rejection of Erastian politicking, and unwavering commitment to the authority of the Church’s ordained hierarchy. Adherence to the Cyprianic schema became an engine of radicalization. A commitment to the Church’s spiritual sovereignty expanded to countenance separating from the English state.¹²

Jeremy Collier was one of the disgruntled Anglicans. Ordained in 1677, the new priest viscerally experienced the reality of lay domination. His first position was chaplain in the house of the sixth earl of Dorset, Charles Sackville. Dorset was a typical courtier in Charles II’s reign. He was profligate and sustained poets and artists, such as John

¹² Quantin, 13-22; 327; 370-393. J.A.I. Champion, *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730* (Cambridge University Press, 1992), 45-48.

Dryden, who celebrated the merry monarch's repudiation of all things Puritan. Collier weaponized his experience of lay authority in a tract, targeting Dorset's conduct as patron. In 1688, during the heat of controversy between James and the Immortal Seven, Collier published an attack against his former patron.¹³ He complained bitterly that, "the Function of the Clergy in general is too often misunderstood, (which in such a skeptical and licentious age we need not wonder at,) those who officiate in private houses lie under particular disadvantages."¹⁴ This tract was Collier's first published polemic, targeting the institutional failure of chaplaincy within the Restoration Church. He offered a blueprint for the role and dignity of the ordained churchman in relation to his lay patron. Collier argued a "high" Anglican position, claiming the Church's officers possessed an autonomous, though distinct, spiritual power that laymen must submit to and respect.

Collier's prime concern was to prove that the priest, whether in parish ministry or in chaplaincy, was not a creature of his patron, but divinely commissioned. After drawing analogy between a priest and a lawyer, a physician, and a MP, Collier argued that paying clergy "is in reason nothing but a due respect to their Function, and a gratefull acknowledgement of their care; What the Priest receives from us is in effect offered to God Almighty, because 'tis given upon the account of the Relation he hath to him, and the advantages we receive from thence."¹⁵ Like the other professionals, the priest is not beholden to his client for receiving money. However, unlike the above mentioned, payment for the priest's services functioned as an offering to God. Collier argued that this spiritual proficiency and special connection to the divine came from the constitution of

¹³ Boster, 38-42; 52-53.

¹⁴ Jeremy Collier, *The Office of a Chaplain Equir'd into, and Vindicated from Servility and Contempt* (London, 1688), 4.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 9-10.

the Church. In the Old Testament, the Levites tended the affairs of the cult and possessed the right of divine service. They did not own land like the other tribes. Thus, the rest of Israel gave resources to the Levites for their sustenance. Collier argued that this model “did not depend upon any Ceremonial Constitution, but was founded in the unalterable reason of things.”¹⁶ The same arrangement continued into the New Testament through Christ’s commissioning of the Apostles. Glossing Romans 13 with his own interpretation, Collier argued that, “our Spiritual Governours are *Ministers of God* to us as well as our Temporal, *Rom. 13. 4.*, and therefore the Apostle’s inference, *v. 6. May*, in a qualified sense at least, be applied to them, *For this cause pay you Tribute also.*”¹⁷ Collier distinguished between the spiritual and temporal governments to which Paul advocated submission in a single command. The eternal priesthood, carried through the Levites into the Apostles, represented a distinct realm from civil authority. The two did not overlap. Thus, as a commissioned officer of the spiritual kingdom, the lay patron’s material provision was an act of submission to, not dominance over, his chaplain.

Collier further explicated this distinction through enumerating his duties. Negatively, the ordained minister was, “not to disturb the Master of the house in the Government of his Family, nor to intermeddle in his Affairs.”¹⁸ These were temporal affairs that were outside of a priest’s authority. Positively, Collier argued that, “the Office of a Clergyman in a Family, is to Pray for, Bless, and give Absolution to those he is concern’d with; which are all Acts of Authority and Jurisdiction. He is to Counsel, Exhort, and Reprove the Master of the Family himself upon occasion (with respect to his

¹⁶ Ibid., 10-11.

¹⁷ Ibid., 11.

¹⁸ Ibid., 13.

station).”¹⁹ The priest had rights over the conduct of his parish, which included his lay patron, when it came to heavenly affairs. No matter his social rank, the priest had received his office, “from God himself, whose Deputy he is in things pertaining to Religion.”²⁰ The presence of a divinely appointed chaplain blessed the layman with correction and prayer, though it did not challenge the layman’s social rank within civil society. The spiritual and temporal powers ought to remain distinguished between respective authorities.

However, if the Church’s spiritual separation was rejected, it was not only an error, but a grievous sin. Collier recognized that there were those in the Church who acted servile, craving benefits from their patrons. He rebuked these ministers for “inverting that Order which God made between the Priest and people, and denies that Authority which God hath granted for the Edification of his Church.”²¹ That was not all. If a lay patron agreed to the servility of the hierarchy, he was “in effect to challenge Divine Honours, and to set up himself for a God.”²² The priest, as a representative of the Church, was beyond the control of temporal authorities and functioned as one among Heavenly creatures. Collier asserted that “God hath pleas’d to put the Clergy in joynt Comission with the Angels themselves, for the Guidance of, and superintending his Church.”²³ This authority was the same that Christ had given to his Apostles, which continued through the bishops and priests. Even though the Apostles had expanded jurisdiction, as well as composing infallible doctrine, “all act by the same Authority, and

¹⁹ Ibid., 13-14.

²⁰ Ibid., 14.

²¹ Ibid., 20.

²² Ibid., 21.

²³ Ibid., 22.

for the same End.”²⁴ Thus, if laymen attempted to direct the affairs of the Church over and against the clergy, they would be challenging God’s will and design of the Church. For Collier, any inversion of this arrangement was idolatry.

Collier applied this relation between the clergy and the laity to the relation between the Church of England and the state. The Church was “founded in the Appointment of Christ, in that Commission which he gave the Apostles and their Successors, and consequently does not derive its Authority from any Earthly Power.”²⁵ Collier applied this latter injunction against the thirty-third Parliamentary session of Henry VIII, which called lay patrons masters of their chaplains. Collier rebutted that, “Parliament may with equal Right Enact that Parents shall be subject to their Children, and that the wife shall be her husband’s Mistress without a Complement, as make the people the Priests Masters.”²⁶ Collier connected a priest’s submission to lay authority to clear tropes of a world turned upside down. No civil government could rewrite the divine law which established both temporal and spiritual authorities. Collier wryly noted that Parliament had as much authority to control the clergy as “they have to vote down the Canon of Scripture, or to decree Sacrilege to be no sin.”²⁷ Lay authority interfering with the Church’s government was equivalent to deciding matters of doctrine, an allusion to Hobbes’ Leviathan. Collier considered any interference in the Church’s practices or government to the most radical form of Erastian polity. Intermixture of responsibilities between the Church and the state turned the world upside down.

²⁴ Ibid., 23.

²⁵ Ibid., 25.

²⁶ Ibid., 25.

²⁷ Ibid., 26.

However, Collier noted that the Church could benefit from partnership with civil government as long as the latter benefited the former. Church preferments, which lay authorities had determined, were not essential, but were graciously bestowed. The episcopacy granted this “trust” to lay persons as a means to guard and expand the Church Catholic.²⁸ In reverse, the lay authorities may bestow wealth on the clergy so that, “they might not be overawed, and almost struck dumb with the glitterings of Title, or Fortune.”²⁹ A becoming amount of wealth helped ministers resist bribes and sycophancy. The temporal authority could bless the Church with such things and receive blessing in return. Both realms supported one another to better promote God’s design. But giving honor did not imply ownership. To the contrary, if lay people claimed control of the Church, whether over tithes or offices, Collier raged that such people were “in effect to sacrifice to the Devil with that which is consecrated to God Almighty.”³⁰ Any who challenged the Church’s divine order and commission were engaged in an inversion of religion, offering a sacrifice on another altar to another god. Each realm, state and Church, possessed a different order of authority. Lay encroachment was not merely improper, but sacrilege.

Collier’s fears came to realization in the accession of William and his demand for oaths to his new government. Failing to comply, in 1691 William deprived the intransigent bishops and priests, and he filled their offices with men who pledged fealty. While the Non-Juror schism began over the oath, the deprivations began the rupture between two ecclesiastical visions. Edward Stillingfleet, bishop of Worcester and arch

²⁸ Ibid., 29-30.

²⁹ Ibid., 35.

³⁰ Ibid., 29-32.

Latitudinarian, defended the new regime and attacked the Non-Jurors as schismatics. He had a long career as a churchman advocating an intermixture of the Church into the state, creating a unified Christian society. In his 1662 second edition to *Irenicum*, Stillingfleet emended the text to remove any trace of Hobbism or indifference to the Commonwealth. But he remained committed to the idea of a Christian magistrate governing over both church and state. While the magistrate did not create doctrine, he did enforce the peace of the realm, including the government of the Church. The chief magistrate had “power relative to ecclesiastical affairs”, which included the right to install and depose clergy. The Church was an institution akin to Parliament, a constituent element of the whole nation under the sovereign, the Christian prince. Stillingfleet argued for an English realm that comprehended the Church, along with all other social organs, into a holistic Christian polity.³¹

Previously, during the Restoration, Stillingfleet had deployed these arguments against Dissenters, who had agitated for tolerance through the king’s dispensational powers.³² Against critics, Stillingfleet argued that once a nation accepted Christianity the particular Church of that realm was “incorporated into one Christian Society, under the same common ties and Rules of Order and Government.”³³ All Englishmen, as English,

³¹ Edward Stillingfleet, *Irenicum; A Weapon Salve for the Church’s Wounds; or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government*, 2nd Ed. (London, 1662), 37-51. For an analysis of Stillingfleet’s ecclesiological position, see John Marshall, “The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and ‘Hobbism’,” *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (1985), 412-415. As an interesting and noteworthy aside, Stillingfleet’s argument for Church’s power as parallel to Parliament’s power was replayed, with significant changes, in High Churchman Francis Atterbury’s call for Convocation in 1697. This similarity raises suspicion about claims for intellectual kinship between the High Church party and the Non-Juror Church. For an account of Atterbury’s ecclesiology, see Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 48-57.

³² Rose, *Godly Kingship in Restoration England*, 175.

³³ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Mischief of Separation: A Sermon Preached at Guild-Hall Chappel, May II. MDCLXXX Being the First Sunday in Easter-Term, Before the Lord Mayor, &c.* (London, 1680), 16.

were within the same Christian society, which the established Church helped maintain. Dissenters, as Englishmen, had no leg to stand upon without becoming treasonous rebels. Responding to critics Richard Baxter and John Owen, Stillingfleet argued that the Christian magistrate was the source of both the Church's discipline and offices. Bishops were none other than "the King's visitors and commissioners" to maintain order and unity. The king was also just to eject non-conforming ministers in 1662. For if the king could not eject priests and replace them, Stillingfleet argued, then all law would dissolve. If the logic of Dissent prevailed, England would return to Roman Catholicism, which also rejected the Christian magistrate's government of the Church. Arguments for conscience were insufficient reasons to separate, as conscience was too flimsy and could not provide a ground of unity. Against private judgement, the Church, established by king in Parliament, was the "wisdom of the Whole Nation." Therefore, Dissenters, for obedience to the king and the unity of the nation around Protestant orthodoxy, ought to hold their noses and reenter. For Stillingfleet, the Church was England at prayer, and the prince had the right to require submission to his ecclesiastical laws.³⁴

Stillingfleet redeployed these same criticisms against the Non-Jurors. In response to bishop William Beveridge, who declined the deprived see of Bath and Wells, Stillingfleet defended the king's right to fill and empty the Church's offices. Beveridge had sworn the oath to William but was reluctant to take the bishopric of the saintly Non-

³⁴ Edward Stillingfleet, *The Unreasonableness of Separation, or, An impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present separation from the communion of the Church of England to which, several late letters are annexed, of eminent Protestant divines abroad, concerning the nature of our differences, and the way to compose them* (London, 1681), 76-77; 152-155; 220-221; 239-243. Marshall, "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men", 409-410. For an account of tolerance, and attacks on conscience, as a strategy for conformity, see Andrew R. Murphy, *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001), 144-148.

Juror Thomas Ken. Stillingfleet rejected Beveridge's hesitancy as inconsistent. Beveridge acknowledged William as rightful king, and the right to fill bishoprics was "an Authority which belongs to the Imperial Crown of England."³⁵ The king had the rights to empty and fill the offices of the Church for the stability of the realm. However, if one rejected this logic, the Non-Juror position was a logical outcome. Stillingfleet explained that "if it be unlawful to succeed a deprived Bishop, then he is the Bishop of the Diocess [sic] still; and then the Law that deprives him is no Law, and consequently the King and Parliament, that made that Law, no King nor Parliament."³⁶ Since Beveridge swore the oath to the king, he would be inconsistent to deny the king's right to deprive and offer that position. However, Stillingfleet pressed the point further. He argued that "if the deprived Bishop be the only lawful Bishop, then the People and Clergy of his Diocess [sic] are bound to own him and no other [...] the clergy, who live in Communion with Schismatical Bishops, are Schismatics themselves; and the whole Church of England now established by Law is Schismatical."³⁷ According to Stillingfleet, Beveridge ought to accept the office, along with an ecclesiastical vision which empowered the king, or become a Non-Juror. There was no middle ground.

To further elucidate his position, Stillingfleet laid out the principles behind the conforming Church. First, if the Church Catholic existed within a "Christian Nation and Government, the Church is incorporated into the State, and the Sovereign [sic] Power has a Supremacy in all Ecclesiastical Causes."³⁸ This arrangement was what made the Church

³⁵ Edward Stillingfleet, *A VINDICATION OF Their Majesties Authority TO FILL The SEES of the Deprived Bishops in a letter out of the country occasioned by Dr. B—'s refusal of the bishoprick of Bath and Wells* (London, 1691), 13.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, 15.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 15-16.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, 18.

of England Protestant. If one rejected the Christian prince's "Ecclesiastical Authority", then one would "set up a Pope, or a Presbytery, or a National Synod, above the Supream Power."³⁹ Stillingfleet understood the claim for the Church as a separate power, but rejected it as a precursor to creating another Rome or Puritan Commonwealth. However, if the Christian prince possessed such authority, and the Church was conjoined to the state, then "the denial of the King's Supremacy in Ecclesiastical Causes, was thought a good Reason to depose Bishops."⁴⁰ If it were otherwise, and bishops could oppose the ecclesiastical decisions of a Christian prince, Stillingfleet concluded that "the Church must be divided from the State, and be independent on [sic] it."⁴¹ Beveridge was either to remain a good Protestant, accepting the king's offer with a good conscience, or he was to drift away into schism. Stillingfleet blemished the Non-Jurors with the appellations of Popery and Dissent, the two heads of a single error. In doing so, he made the schism about a radically different ecclesiastical vision. Independency of the Church was the sole issue driving the movement. Stillingfleet condemned the Non-Jurors as adherents to an alien ecclesiology.

Stillingfleet's chaplain, Humphrey Hody, further exacerbated tensions when he published "Baroccian Ms", a late Byzantine ecclesiastical history from the thirteenth century, hidden in the dusty stacks of Oxford. The prefacer⁴² acclaimed that such a find was "singular Providence" for the "unsatisfied persons of the Church of England," since

³⁹ Ibid., 19.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 20-21.

⁴¹ Ibid., 21.

⁴² The prefacer's initials, "R.B.", most likely belong to Richard Bentley. A Cambridge trained classicist, Bentley joined Stillingfleet's household in 1683, being a fellow chaplain with Hody. For Bentley's professional development, and engagement with Byzantine texts, see Kristine Louise Haugen, *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 56-65; 81-99.

it had “authorities of Antiquity (that Antiquity, which they profess to imitate, and pretend to allege).” The account contained various examples of emperors who deposed bishops for politique reasons, which the Church accepted even though they were unjust. Of course, the prefacer coyly professed that “God forbid, that the Case [...] should be thought parallel to that of our New Bishops [...] as if they needed that kind of defence.” Far be it that he accused William of injustice! Rather, the prefacer’s point was that the Non-Jurors had no leg to stand on. Even if the crown was unjust in its declarations (which it was not) the Church ought to receive such judgements for the peace of the nation.⁴³ Hody and the prefacer attempted to refute the Non-Jurors on their own ground of patristic antiquity. He had men like Dodwell and Hickes, well-reputed for their scholarly erudition and “high” view of the Church’s episcopacy, in his sights. However, this manuscript was far later than the scholarship the Non-Jurors used. This clumsy attack attempted to defeat the Non-Jurors on the grounds of history, though one they took serious issue with. The failure of the attack notwithstanding, Hody and his patrons had placed their finger on the heart of the schism. The Non-Jurors grounded their defiance in an appeal to the Church’s historical understanding of itself in relationship to kings and emperors.

In addition to seeking to attack his opponents, the prefacer defended William’s accession and his subsequent ecclesiastical policies. As referenced above, the manuscript’s appearance was “providence.” Whether the prefacer was genuine in his sentiment, or Hody honest in his discovery, is irrelevant. The appeal to providence fit the

⁴³ R.B., “Preface”, in *The Unreasonable of a Separation from the New Bishops Or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, Shewing, That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither He nor the Church ever made a Separation; if the Successor was not a Heretic* (London, 1691).

manuscript within a larger justification for the Revolution. Defenders of William saw his victory as divinely appointed. William would not be king if God had not deigned it so. Providence became a backbone for regime propaganda, defending against accusations of usurpation.⁴⁴ The prefacer linked Hody's scholarly work to this divine plan, where the success of the Church and the crown were inextricably linked. In addition, the prefacer sought to explain why William was right to deprive and fill ecclesiastical office. There was no bishop because "[he] will acknowledge no duty to the Civil Magistrate, which protects him; if he shall refuse to act in his Function; if he will not be the Bishop, somebody else must be."⁴⁵ The prefacer intertwined the civil and spiritual duties of the bishop as shepherd of the Church. The bishop protected his flock, requiring proper submission to civil authorities who guaranteed peace and prosperity. If the bishop would not acknowledge the civil magistrate, he was not a bishop. The Church was not a separable, parallel, society to the secular realm of England. Rather, both the state and the Church occupied a single domain.

The Non-Jurors rejected Hody's claims, both as dishonest scholarship and heretical theology. Unlike Hody or his patron Stillingfleet, the Non-Jurors rejected an integrated Christian society where the Church was a constituent part under the Christian prince. The Restoration saw the development of disparate ecclesiologies within the Church of England, opposed to one another at a fundamental level. The Glorious

⁴⁴ Tony Claydon, *William III and the Godly Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 106. Rachel Weil, *A Plague of Informers: Conspiracy and Political Trust in William III's England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013), 250-253. William's government was tapping into a providential theology that was vibrant within the Restoration Church of England. See John Spurr, "'Virtue, Religion and Government': The Anglican use of Providence" in *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, eds. Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 40-41.

⁴⁵ R.B., "The Preface", *The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the New Bishops*.

Revolution only provided a fitting ground for this debate to flare up into actual schism. William's deprivations did not create this view of the Church but only catalyzed it. The Non-Jurors deployed a Cyprianic schema, one which argued for the bishop as the spiritual monarch, one who the king had no jurisdiction over in matters relating to the Church. Hody's manuscript, and his prefacer's arguments framing it, provided an opportunity for Non-Jurors to attack the underlying premises of conforming churchmen and highlight what was at stake for the Church of England.

In 1692, Nathaniel Bisbie, a Non-Juror presbyter, wrote a refutation of the prefacer's ecclesiology, depending upon Cyprian's legacy as normative for the Church. Having cited the council of Carthage, which Cyprian had led, Bisbie argued that the bishops, and their gathering in episcopal synods, held supreme power in the Church Catholic. This arrangement remained a constant, as "neither did the Emperors by becoming Christians alter the case."⁴⁶ While Christian magistrates could call bishops together, emperors were bound to the Church's decision, determining how they could act. Ecclesiastical and civil authorities remained two distinct nodes of power in a Christian society. To put the case more succinctly, Bisbie apocryphally quoted king Edgar of England as saying to the archbishop of Canterbury: "[I] wear the Sword of Constantine, and you of St. Peter."⁴⁷ The Church's history affirmed a difference between the spiritual realm of the Church and the secular realm of the state, one present even in English history.

⁴⁶ Nathaniel Bisbie, *Unity of Priesthood Necessary to the Unity of Communion in a Church, With some Reflections on the Oxford Manuscript and the Preface annexed. Also Collections of Canons, part of the said Manuscript, faithfully translated into English from the Original, but concealed by Mr. Hody, and his Prefacer*, (London, 1692), 21.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.

Thus, contrary to Hody's claims of antiquity, Bisbie decried the manuscript as coming from "the middle and corrupt Age of the Church; and therefore of little or no force against the Practice of the more Primitive and purer Age."⁴⁸ According to Bisbie, Hody and his prefacer had completely misunderstood the Non-Juror appeal to Cyprian. Both Hody and Bisbie depended upon the humanist tradition of history as source of legitimacy and authority. Historical example offered the possibility of final arbitration. However, the African bishop was not normative because he was merely older, but because he maintained apostolic, and thus divine, practice.⁴⁹ The fact the whole Church followed Cyprian was proof that it was indeed the teaching of Scripture. Catholicity provided the rule for judging historical example. Cyprian's example, and the canons of the Church Catholic that resulted, was sufficient proof to reject the prince's ecclesiastical power. The sacred history of the Church was against any claim that the magistrate could change, alter, or affect the offices of the Church.

Bisbie also countered the claim that England's Reformation restored, or reaffirmed, the Christian prince's ecclesiastical sovereignty. To the contrary, Bisbie argued the royal supremacy justified the Commonwealth's abolition of the episcopacy. Instead, an episcopal convocation of the Church of England established reforms to the Church, the institutionalization of the prayer book, and the deprivation of clergy still loyal to Rome. Bisbie stated unequivocally that "the Authority to handle and define such things which belong to Faith in the Sacraments, and Discipline Ecclesiastical, hath hitherto ever belonged, and only ought to belong to the Pastor of the Church, whom the

⁴⁸ Ibid., 58.

⁴⁹ Champion, 47-52.

Holy Spirit hath placed in the Church, and not unto Lay-Men.” Not only did the Church have sole authority to determine matters of faith, which both conformist and Non-Juror churchmen agreed on, the Church also had the right to determine issues of discipline, which included removal from office. Unless the king acted upon a decision from the Church, the monarch had no right to interfere with ecclesiastical government, whether matters of faith or otherwise.⁵⁰

Henry Dodwell, that lay titan of patristic scholarship and antiquities, joined the fray as well. He levelled a broadside against Hody’s manuscript and its underlying ecclesiology. He was well reputed among the Ancients, arguing for a past that was paradigmatic for present action. However, Dodwell did not judge antiquity as sufficient reason for emulation. The past was normative only if it provided a holy template, which included unity among its virtues. The words and deeds of saints, especially Cyprian, were paradigmatic for the life of the Church because the Church recognized it as God’s truth.⁵¹ Against Hody’s appeal to antiquity, *tout court*, Dodwell cautioned that “if Matters of Fact so nakedly mentioned must be urged for Precedents [...] How easie were it for an Historian, by this Way of Reasoning, to justifie, as our Brethren do, the wickedest things that can be!”⁵² Rather, Dodwell countered that, since the manuscript came from a later Byzantine period “[it] cannot pretend to argue the Sense of the Catholick Church, nor of

⁵⁰ Bisbie, *Unity of Priesthood*, 27; 44-45.

⁵¹ C.D.A Leighton, “Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell” in *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 31 (2005), 10-11. The categories of Ancients and Moderns were in flux among intellectuals in the later seventeenth century, with men on either side sympathizing with the other. See Joseph M. Levine, *Between the Ancients and the Moderns: Baroque Culture in Restoration England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999), ix-x.

⁵² Henry Dodwell, *A Vindication of the deprived Bishops, asserting their spiritual rights against a lay deprivation, against the charge of schism, as managed by the late editors of an anonymous Baroccian ms in two parts...to which is subjoined the latter end of the said ms. omitted by the editors, making against them and the cause espoused by them, in Greek and English* (London, 1692), 11.

those Ages which are most to be regarded, not onely for their Antiquity, but their Integrity also.”⁵³ Against Hody’s exempla of emperors deposing bishops without consent of the Church, Dodwell appealed to Cyprian and his age “not only because they are the ancientest [...] but because we have withal in him the most distinct account of the Sense of the Church in his Age of such Facts, and of the Principles on which they proceeded in condemning them.”⁵⁴ The truth of Cyprian’s teaching was then subsequently proven from its vast and continued approval. The fact that “This Catholic Communion, grounded on the common Interest of all the Bishops,” which was a “a multitude of absolute and independent Societies,” followed Cyprian was proof such a teaching was “from their very first Originals”, meaning the Scriptures.⁵⁵ For Dodwell, Cyprian’s example was normative not only because it was the oldest, but because Cyprian’s experience reflected the Church’s true teaching, which the Church with a single voice proclaimed. Since the Church Catholic had accepted the African bishop’s life and deeds in dealing with the Novatians, he was a pure paradigm. Dodwell’s appeal to history depended upon a theological claim about the status of the Church and its divine origin.

The principle St. Cyprian had secured for the Church Catholic was the independency of the Church from civil society. Dodwell argued that “this Lay-deprivation [...] is, in the Principles of the Catholick Church of St. Cyprian’s Age, a perfect Nullity, and consequently that, in regard to Conscience at least, our present Bishops are still Bishops.”⁵⁶ The episcopacy possessed the sole right to affirm or eject the Church’s officers, and therefore the magistrate had created a schism through interference.

⁵³ Ibid., 16.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 22.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 23.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 18.

However, rather than blame civil authorities, Dodwell targeted those churchmen who conformed to William's actions. Attacking his opponents as holding "Latitudinarian Opinions", Dodwell blasted conformists who "always weaken and dissolve the Obligation in Conscience to maintain the Church as a Society in a time of Persecution from the Civil Magistrate."⁵⁷ If the Church was intertwined with the magistrate and submitted to his power, then one had submitted primarily to the state, and only incidentally to the Church. Since such conformists never were obliged to the Church due to such principles, they were apt to divide the Church when a magistrate willed against orthodox doctrine and practice. Therefore, Dodwell argued that those who abided by such principles would become "Heretical" since a heresy was nothing more than that which "sets up or abets a Communion opposite to that of the Church, on account of Opinions."⁵⁸ The conforming churchmen had not only caused a schism from the true Church, they had done so because they were heretics waiting to happen. The independence of the Church was key to preserving orthodoxy within the Church Catholic. Anything less than autonomy was, for Dodwell, a potential lapse into heresy, a poison waiting to attack Christ's body.

However, Dodwell was not opposed to cooperation between the civil monarch, the king, and the ecclesial monarch, the bishop. Contrary to the conforming Church, Dodwell argued that "the Doctrines and Practices, in defence of which our Holy Fathers have incurred this Deprivation, are more for the Interest even of the State, even of the Civil Magistracy."⁵⁹ Ecclesiastical blessing enhanced the magistrate since "the State

⁵⁷ Ibid., 26.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 27.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 102.

cannot subsist without Obligations of Conscience and Sacredness of Oaths.”⁶⁰ The Church could grant an aura of legitimacy to civil regimes only if the Church was not a creature of the state. Dodwell had no desire to sever the Church from a working relation with the crown. The argument was conciliatory. He was even willing to place the argument in terms favorable to the state. Yet, Dodwell’s reach across the aisle did not compromise on the independency of the Church, with the concomitant possibility of separation. The king had much to gain through partnership, but Dodwell’s Church would rather suffer than be reduced to a department of state. Such a fate was to become a heretical communion and a defilement of the Church’s spiritual constitution.

Advocacy for the Church as an autonomous spiritual society mapped onto Collier’s experiences. His time in Dorset’s house forged a deep antipathy to any lay control over the Church. When Collier took up his pen, he was already committed to the spiritual autonomy of the Church. After the events of the Glorious Revolution, Collier joined the choir of Non-Jurors, being stripped of office for failing to swear the new oath. In 1692, Collier released a pamphlet defending independency in the wake of the deprivations. In it, Collier remarked that “Our Saviour foresaw that all the Princes of the World would disbelieve, and many of them Persecute his Doctrine for several Ages together; and therefore, would be very improper Persons to have been trusted with the Sovereign Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs.”⁶¹ This pessimistic account consigned all secular authorities to being potential enemies of the Church. Instead, if princes were related to the Church, their secular powers were only for external support. Exegeting a

⁶⁰ Ibid., 102.

⁶¹ Jeremy Collier, *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church-Power* (London, 1692), 4.

biblical prophecy, popular in defense of royal supremacy, Collier countered that “the character of their being Nursing Fathers, is sufficiently fulfilled by their affording Christians Protection and Encouragement under their government.”⁶² However, such an arrangement was violated if the king acted to “alter the Seat of Ecclesiastical Government, put a Period to the Apostolic Succession, and dissolve the Church into the State.”⁶³ In Collier’s ecclesiology the king had no right to meddle in episcopal succession. As temporal arm, the magistrate could protect the Church, but had no role in its government. Any intervention threatened the Church’s integrity.

Collier pressed clerical government further, extending spiritual autonomy down to the presbyterate. The priest was not merely an extension of the bishop but shared in his power over the rule and the governance of the Church. Collier argued that the “Privilege of Independency, in matters purely Spiritual, will reach the Inferior Clergy. For their Authority being derived from the Bishops, and of the same Nature with theirs, it can be subordinate, or related, to no other Head of Jurisdiction.”⁶⁴ Thus, whatever spiritual power of the Church the bishops possessed, even the mere priest Collier had in like measure. Magistrates, on the other hand, possessed no distinct position in the Church. Referring to the baptism of Constantine, Collier countered that “as for Baptism, there is no Authority of any kind implied in the Receiving that Sacrament; If there were, every Christian would have an equal share in this Privilege.”⁶⁵ If the king had spiritual power due to his baptism then, *reductio ab absurdum*, so did every other lay person. For Collier, such would be a tumble into anarchy and the dissolution of the Church’s government.

⁶² Ibid., 6.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 11.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 7.

One may detect reference to the Commonwealth, with its breakdown of all ecclesiastical control and the growth of a variety of sects. If the Church of England was to avoid a return to dissolution then only the ordained hierarchy had spiritual authority. Collier, as a priest, had ecclesiastical rights over the king and all other lay figures. No civil authority could interfere in the Church's spiritual offices, including who it ordained or ejected.

To counter condemnations from the conforming episcopacy, Collier argued only the Non-Jurors were rightful hierarchs. Collier reasoned that since these churchmen had "subjected the Power of the Keys to the Civil Supremacy; given up, as much as in them lies, the Fundamental Rights of the Church [...] the Charge of Schism and Separation must lie at their own Doors."⁶⁶ Schism was not a numbers game, but reflected whether the bishops collectively maintained the integrity of their office. Since those willing to conform to William's actions had impugned their brethren, they departed from the unity of the Church. The conforming Church was schismatic from all those the bishops who held their ground, and refused to recognize William's right to select and eject ministers. As a priest, Collier was on good ground to follow the Non-Juror bishops against their conforming counterparts. Akin to his chaplaincy days, the servility of priests seeking lay favor had no truck with him. As an ordained priest, his powers remained, contrary to the behavior of his brother priests.

Collier outlined the parameters and limits of the Church's spiritual power. Collier claimed that the Church had no right to land, property, or temporal privileges. The Church's powers did not include "merely Secular Estates, their Civil Privileges and

⁶⁶ Ibid., 10.

Jurisdictions [...] of which they may be legally (though not always equitably) disseized, whenever the Legislative Authority of a Kingdom shall think fit to do it.”⁶⁷ The king had every right to strip ministers of their titles of nobility, eject bishops from the House of Lords, and seize the clergy’s money, even if it was to the Church’s harm. The true Church “allows no Liberty to Dethrone Princes for misfortunes of Belief [...] nor founds any Merit upon Ingratitude and Rebellion. In short, this Authority relates only to Conscience.”⁶⁸ In disclaiming such ambitions, Collier distanced himself from accusations of being a papist or dissenter. Both groups were accused of fomenting rebellion through agitation for the Church’s independence. As seen above in *Stillingfleet*, this accusation was a well-worn trope within the Restoration Church against dissent. However, Non-Jurors utilized this tactic to cast aspersions upon their conforming critics. Typecasting opponents within the Church, rather than without, was an unsettling novelty within post-revolution churchmanship.⁶⁹ Following this new pattern, Collier attempted to outflank his interlocutors, claiming the mantle of passive obedience. It was he, and not his conforming opponents, who remained loyal to the Church of England’s political legacy. The independence of the Church, not its subordination, provided the best way to preserve social order. In doing so, Collier cloaked this ecclesiastical radicality in the shroud of the Church’s political theology. Ironically, Collier argued that he was a better subject of the crown because he fought the king when he encroached on the Church’s independency.

In the positive, the Church’s spiritual power included administration of the sacraments. The Non-Jurors emphasized the Lord’s Supper as the pinnacle of worship

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶⁸ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁶⁹ William J. Bulman, *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire, 1648-1715* (Cambridge University Press, 2015), 115-117; 260; 277.

and the means of spiritual vitality, something they continued from Restoration era piety.⁷⁰ Emphasizing the seriousness of the sacrament, Collier argued that without due administration of the Eucharist “we can have no pretence to the Covenant of Grace, no Title to the Assistance of God’s Spirit; nor any Assurance of a Blessed Immortality.”⁷¹ Such a position was within the bounds of orthodoxy, but Collier pressed this idea into affirming the Church’s autonomy. If the Eucharist was “both necessary to make us Members of the Church, and to convey the Advantages of Christianity [and] by our Saviours special Appointment entrusted with the Clergy”, then, Collier concluded “it follows, that those who have the sole Right of Admitting into a Society, or Excluding from it [...] are the proper and only Govenors of that Society; and can have no Dependance upon any other.”⁷² Collier attached the undisputed right of the clergy to administer sacraments to the independency of the Church. Since the magistrate was only a lay man, and had no authority to celebrate the Eucharist, then he also had no right to exclude from the Church. If, however, the civil magistrate sought such powers, God would not be mocked. Collier warned that “the Fate of *Corah* and *Uzziah* (*Numb. 16.2. Chron.26.*) are sufficient to deter all Secular Persons from an Encroachment of this Nature.”⁷³ This example referred to Biblical figures who transgressed God’s ordained hierarchy and were punished with death. If God had established the Church’s offices and powers, the princes who tampered with such would face divine wrath. For Collier, the sacraments became an argument in favor of the Church’s independence as a separate,

⁷⁰ Spurr, *The Restoration Church of England*, 345-350. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 161.

⁷¹ Collier, *Independency of Church-Power*, 3.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 4.

⁷³ *Ibid.*

spiritual, society. To undermine this autonomy, to cross the Church, was to flirt with divine destruction.

Collier was not alone in his attack. He grounded his arguments in Dodwell and the Cyprianic age. Citing “the Vindicator”, from the name of Dodwell’s pamphlet, Collier approved the use of the African who revealed that “the Catholick Church maintained the Right of Canonical Bishops, both against Secular Magistrates, and Schismatical Intruders.”⁷⁴ Collier joined himself to Dodwell’s Cyprianic defense of the Church’s independence. Yet, Collier pressed the arguments more aggressively. Summarizing Dodwell’s scholarship, he concluded that “it is no more in the Power of the State to deprive the Church Governors of their purely Spiritual Authority, than it is in the Power of the Church to remove the Magistracy, or disincorporate the State.”⁷⁵ By permitting William to deprive, the conforming churchmen heralded a return to either Rome or Cromwell. The Non-Jurors not only retained true doctrine, but also advocated for social peace. Collier utilized Dodwell’s Cyprianic schema to not only defend the Non-Jurors, but discredit conforming churchmen and the regime they defended.

Collier applied his Non-Juror ecclesiology in polemics for specific actions within the Church. He defended how, as a priest, he enacted the Church’s liturgies. The Non-Juror’s doctrine and practice became conjoined in Collier’s life and work. His first foray was attacking the new state prayers for William and Mary. The Book of Common Prayer commended the Church to pray for the lawful monarch. But with the crowns offered to William and Mary, and James having fled to France, it was unclear which monarch held

⁷⁴ Ibid., 8.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 10.

the right to these prayers. Thus, the state prayers of the Church exacerbated the difference between Non-Juror and conforming priests. Collier joined this conflict, decrying the new state prayers as “civil Idolatry.”⁷⁶ According to his argument, the Church was to pray for the common good of the realm in which it dwelled. If the Church prayed for a usurper, as Collier believed William clearly was, then it was upending the virtues it commended.

Now that the Church was to pray for William, Collier mocked “I confess it is high time to alter the Liturgy, and to invoke Heaven for Plague, Famine, and Conspiracies, and most of those other Miseries and Sins which we are taught to pray against.”⁷⁷ Prayers for William were an inversion of the Christian religion and repurposing the liturgy for the needs of the usurper.

However, the concern was not primarily political. Collier couched his refutation in terms of the Church’s independence. The Church’s prayers were not only for the good of the kingdom, but effected recognition of the king’s title. Collier argued that “giving the Style of Sovereign to a Person in Divine Service, is a solemn acknowledgement of his Title.”⁷⁸ This point is proved in royal attempts to manipulate the Church’s decision. It is clear, Collier continued “by the Management of their Purses and Censures, that they imagine they have gained over their Preacher, when they have once worked him up to Naming.”⁷⁹ The hierarchy of the Church directed the opinions of the laity in performing their Christian duty of obedience to lawful prince. Collier connected this power to conspiracies of controlling the Church. These nodes of power were distinct. It was within

⁷⁶ Jeremy Collier, *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers* (London, 1690), 2.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 5

⁷⁹ Ibid.

the Church's power to adhere to the law of the land, blessing the one who had the legal right to title. It was such a process that rebels and usurpers attempted to control for their own benefit. Hence Collier mapped conforming clergy onto St. Paul's condemnation, glossing "*if he pleased men (Out of Principles of Interest or Servility) he should not be the Servant of Christ*".⁸⁰ If the conforming Church was offering its services to the prince, the Church was acting opposite to its design. They inverted the purposes of the state prayers, which signified the Church's ability to bless legitimate reigns, helping to secure peace. To offer these prayers to William, who entered England at the head of an army, was to make the Church a mercenary, selling blessings for other forms of compensation. In contrast, Collier highlighted that the prayers helped contain the unbridled ambitions of princes. As laymen, princes ought to be subservient to the Church.

In contrast to Collier's attack, William Sherlock attempted to disarm the Non-Juror assault. Sherlock had hedged his position on the oaths, but eventually swore and, likely as a favor, gained the flush deanery of St. Paul's. As one who would become a strong, though controversial, voice for the nascent High Church party, Sherlock vociferously defended William's rule. Contrary to many previous accounts, Sherlock reveals a radical disjuncture between what became the High Church position and the Non-Jurors. While both believed the threefold ministry was *jure divino*, the Non-Jurors pressed this distinction to argue for a wholly spiritual, and wholly discrete, Church. While the High Churchmen accepted the king's ecclesiastical primacy, the Non-Jurors held to a Cyprianic arrangement. The bishop and the king were equal in authority but in separate, non-overlapping, realms. The former only governed things pertaining to the soul

⁸⁰ Ibid.

and its salvation. The Church had no claim to civil authority, title, or wealth, which all belonged to the magistrate. But the magistrate had no authority over the Church, including its officers. The king had as much right to defrock a bishop as a bishop to depose the king. The Glorious Revolution did not birth this ecclesiology but amplified existing trends within the later Stuart Church. Sherlock, as a representative of what would become the High Church party, would have no truck with this Cyprianic schema. While there was superficial similarity between the two, the Non-Jurors and the High Churchmen opposed one another over the church's relationship to the monarch.⁸¹

Against Non-Juror principles, Sherlock vindicated the new oaths, and subsequent state prayers, through an appeal to the Church's canon law. Citing the convocation of 1603, he argued that the Church's doctrine was "to condemn all those wicked means whereby such Changes of Government are made, and yet to assert, That whenever such Changes are made, the Authority is Gods, and must be obeyed."⁸² Sherlock construed the relationship between king and the Church as one where the latter must submit to the existence of the former. While the Church may contest the means of the monarch's assent, the Church must assent to the new sovereign. The Church submits to him without recourse. Continuing, Sherlock referenced the convocation's example of Jaddus and

⁸¹ Kenneth Padley, "Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange," *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (2008), 683-684; 696. While Sirota argues there was a High Church faction both before and after the Revolution, men like Sherlock were "squaring" High Church Anglican theology to a Tory party program. Unlike Pincus' account of Tory and Whig politics defining ecclesiastical factions, Sirota acknowledges that High Churchmen were not the same after the Revolution. There was discomfort between the two approaches. Besides this point of difference, Sirota follows Pincus' analysis of the Glorious Revolution as a truly disruptive and radically open moment, which eventually discredited the High Church party. While I reject the claim that the High Church party existed before the Revolution, Sirota clearly notices readjustment and realignment among Tory churchmen after William's accession. See Steven Pincus, *1688: The First Modern Revolution* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011), 402-424. Brent S. Sirota, "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered'", 44-45.

⁸² William Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance due to sovereign powers, defended, &c.* (London, 1691), 4.

Alexander. Jaddus was High Priest of Israel when Alexander conquered Jerusalem, taking it from the Persian empire. Jaddus swore an oath of obedience to Alexander. From this example, Sherlock concluded that “Princes, who have no Legal Right to their Thrones, when they are placed there by God, are invested with God’s Authority, and must be revered and obeyed by all Subjects.”⁸³ Therefore, the Church must obey William’s providential invasion of England and his title to the crown. The relation between civil and ecclesiastical authority was understood within a broader, and single, social polity.

Collier responded directly to Sherlock, attacking his use of the Church’s convocation. Collier made it plain that he had no “Roman Pretences” of determining the crown.⁸⁴ Yet, the Church was not to be cowed into accepting “Captain Tom the most Sovereign and Divine Thing upon Earth.”⁸⁵ Collier agreed with Sherlock that the monarch was supreme ruler, established by God. However, it was law and right that established kings, not the accidents of success. Collier grounded his defense along his Cyprianic schema of the Church. In rhetorical key, Collier asked “let us suppose, according to *St. Cyprian’s* Principle, [...] that a lawful Bishop is deposed by his People, and another chosen and consecrated by the Presbytery, (who are the Spiritual Estates.)”⁸⁶ If Sherlock agreed to the arrangement, which according to Collier was consistent with his argument, then Sherlock “contradicts the Universal Church, and destroys the Episcopal Authority.”⁸⁷ Collier formed his argument around the bishop as a spiritual parallel to the

⁸³ Ibid., 8.

⁸⁴ Jeremy Collier, *Dr. Sherlock’s Case of Allegiance Considered with some remarks upon his Vindication* (London, 1691), 10.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 11.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 16.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 16-17.

temporal monarch, both of which find foundation on a “Divine Bottom.”⁸⁸ The dissolution of civil law into usurpation paralleled the dissolution of canon law into spiritual anarchy. The Church and the state were considered analogous, but wholly distinct, institutions. There were two monarchies, one spiritual and one temporal, where St. Cyprian’s ecclesiology informed both.

In contrast, Sherlock denied the significance of William’s accession for the Church and ignored Collier’s criticisms. Yet, his argument was not divorced from the Church and the liturgy. After defending the providential legitimacy William had acquired, Sherlock concluded with new state prayers that honored the new sovereigns. Referencing the Non-Jurors as “our new Dissenters”, Sherlock prayed God would “preserve our King and Queen, and these Kingdoms, our Liberties, Laws, and Religion, from the wicked Conspiracies of all our enemies.”⁸⁹ This prayer did not differentiate the Church from the state but condemned the Non-Jurors as equivalent to Dissent. Not only did Sherlock not differentiate the Church, his prayer, like the rest of his apology, did not even reference the Church as a body, but placed it, along with all English peoples, beneath the providential accession of William. The Church’s duty was to submit to the providentially selected sovereign. The state prayers were not only a test of loyalty, but revealed different ecclesiological visions. Sherlock’s prayer collapsed differences between Church and the civil authorities for a unified English realm. Liberties, laws, and religion all were conjoined to a single realm, ruled by the monarch. Collier, on the other hand, used the liturgy to shore up his commitment to the independence of the Church.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 17.

⁸⁹ Sherlock, *The Case of the Allegiance.*, 28.

The connection between the Church's liturgy and the Church's independence became manifest in the Absolution Controversy. As an exemplar Non-Juror, Collier applied his Cyprianic schema to liturgical and pastoral practice. The claim to spiritual sovereignty collided with William's government, putting this ecclesiology to the test. In 1696, Collier, along with Snatt and Cook, had publicly absolved William Perkins and John Friend from all their sins. Praying loudly, and laying their hands upon the condemned, the three priests begged God's blessing and reception of the souls of the soon to be departed. They had enacted the Visitation of the Sick, a private liturgy composed for those on their deathbeds. The liturgy intended to comfort the sick and dying with the assurance of God's full pardon for all sins. The absolution occurred when the minister pronounced "Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath left power to his Church to absolve all sinners who truly repent and believe in him, of his great mercy forgive thee thine offences: And by his authority committed to me, I absolve thee from all thy sins."⁹⁰ For the family and friends of the mortally ill, the prayer book includes a collect that admonished "And teach us who survive, in this and other like daily spectacles of mortality, to see how frail and uncertain our own condition is."⁹¹ The Visitation interpreted the penitent's illness and death as within the general providence of God, who governed all the mundane affairs of men. The liturgy created an opportunity to acknowledge man's mortality, weakness, and frailty in a time of grief, focusing on the peace of forgiveness and the struggle of living in corruptible flesh. The priest offered an

⁹⁰ *The Book of Common Prayer* (Cambridge University Press, (1662) 2003), 317.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 322.

assurance of salvation to the dying and his beloved, as well as a lesson in repentance and sober conduct for those still in health.

The 1662 Book of Common Prayer established this formula for the Visitation, but it was not without dispute. While the oath crisis loomed, Comprehension was in the air. In 1689, a Parliamentary committee formed to address a means of bringing moderate dissent back into the Church. One item on the agenda was editing the prayer book's formula for the Visitation. The accepted proposal was a change from "I absolve thee..." to "I pronounce thee absolved."⁹² This alteration shifted emphasis away from the priest's declarative power towards a recognition of what changes had already occurred, a change from an active to passive role. The commission, made up of both Latitudinarians and those who would form the High Church party, accepted this change, but comprehension failed to pass through the Commons and all reforms abated. The changes failed to make headway, but their very proposal signaled that the liturgy's grammar was unstable within the Church. It was this instability that ultimately undermined any scheme of comprehension. If the principle *lex orandi lex credendi* is even remotely accurate, the willingness to change the liturgy placed a question mark over what, exactly, the Church was and the kind of authority its officers possessed. Did the priest bring about God's will through his declaration, or was he merely interpreting what had already come to pass? This ambiguity framed Collier's use of the Visitation and the conforming Church's condemnation of the same.⁹³

⁹² Every, 50.

⁹³ Every, 56-59. For a review of the Latitudinarian concern for the Church's stability, see Ed. Mark Goldie, *The entering book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691, I: Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs* (Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007), 240. For an alternate account of comprehension, see John Spurr, "The Church of

After Collier, Snatt, and Cook enacted the Visitation for Friend and Perkins, high ranking conforming churchmen condemned the act. These members of the episcopal bench put their names to a pamphlet that rejected the Non-Jurors' claim to be acting on behalf of the Church. The bishops who signed the pamphlet represented diverse views within the Church. Edward Fowler and Simon Patrick, well known Latitude men, signed the censure. Moderate Tory clergymen who supported the Revolution, such as Henry Compton and Thomas Tenison also signed the document. Richard Cumberland, who served on James' Ecclesiastical Commission, among other Jacobite-leaning churchmen signed as well. Even William Lloyd, one of the Immortal Seven, who stood alongside future Non-Jurors Thomas Ken and William Sancroft, signed.⁹⁴ Latitude men and High Churchmen, Whig, Tory and closet Jacobite, all joined together to condemn Collier's actions as subversive. These conforming churchmen, whatever differences lay between them, were united against the three Non-Juror priests for their actions.

The bishops condemned Collier and his brother priests for "pretending to Absolve the said Criminals at their Execution."⁹⁵ The reasoning was that neither Friend nor Perkins were contrite for their role in the Assassination Plot. Friend had left papers confessing his continued loyalty to James and Perkins did not seem very sorry. Both were not only engaged in "the horrid Design of Assassination" but were acting "in Conjunction with an Army of French Papists, for the Ruine of their Country, and the Extirpation of

England, Comprehension, and the Toleration Act of 1689," *The English Historical Review*, Vol. 54, Issue 413 (1989), 927-946.

⁹⁴ *A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops, and Bishops, Now in and about London, upon the Occasion of their Attendance in Parliament, Concerning the Irregular and Scandalous Proceedings of certain Clergiemen, at the Execution of Sir JOHN FRIEND and Sir WILLIAM PARKINS* (London, 1696), 7.

⁹⁵ *A Declaration*, 3.

that Religion which they themselves do profess.”⁹⁶ Given these circumstances, the bishops found Collier and his brother priests’ behavior inexcusable. The three Non-Jurors had no right to act, for the Church’s liturgy “gave them no Authority, nor no Pretence for the absolving these Persons.”⁹⁷ To the contrary, the priests were suspect, for “they absolved, and that publickly, Persons condemned by Law for Execrable [sic] Crimes, without so much as once moving them at that time to make a special confession of their Sins.”⁹⁸ The bishops linked the survival of the Church with the success of William. They tied the criminal statute, which had condemned William Perkins, to the Church’s power to comfort the dying. The conforming Church was united in seeing Collier’s use of the liturgy as political protest, turning Perkins into a “martyr.”⁹⁹ The use of the Visitation was an attack upon the state and the Church’s integral relationship with it, which the conforming bishops sought to vigorously defend.¹⁰⁰

Responding to the bishops in what would be a series of pamphlets, Collier explicitly recognized that he had used the Visitation for a man condemned for treason. Rebutting his episcopal critics, Collier responded with a rhetorical question “Are all people damned that are cast in a Capital Indictment? If so, to what purpose are they visited by Divine [sic], why are they exhorted to Repentance, and Resignation, why should the Church refuse them her Pardon on Earth, when she believes tis passed in Heaven?”¹⁰¹ Perkins’ death was a capital offense according to civil law, but this fact had

⁹⁶ Ibid., 4.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 5.

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 6.

¹⁰⁰ Rupp, 6; 74-75.

¹⁰¹ Jeremy Collier, *A Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, At the Place of Execution. April the 3d., With a Farther Vindication thereof, Occasioned by a Paper, Entitled a Declaration of the Sense of Arch-Bishops and Bishops, &c.* (London, 1696), 2.

little to do with how a priest ought to minister to him. According to Collier, the Visitation's liturgical purpose was to pardon, and that was what Perkins requested. Since asking for pardon presupposes guilt, Perkins was sufficiently penitent. Had Collier rejected Perkins, he would have "failed in [his] Duty, and gone against the Authority both of the Ancient, and English Church."¹⁰² Collier construed the absolution as belonging solely to the realm of the Church. Perkins' civil condemnation had no impact on how he was to be treated. While the conforming bishops collapsed the distinction between threats to the Church and threats to the state, Collier's apology claimed to keep them separate. The ecclesiology of conforming churchmen could not comprehend how Perkins could hang as a traitor and yet die among the faithful.

In addition, Collier defended his performance of the Visitation. While the Book of Common Prayer intended this liturgy for house visits, in the privacy of friends and family Collier had absolved Perkins publicly. However, Collier claimed that he had no time to meet with Perkins before the execution and acted out of necessity. Although Perkins had requested a priest, the guards of Newgate prison hamstrung Collier's efforts to visit him. Collier complained that "I hope I shall not be blamed for Impossibilities of other Mens making."¹⁰³ Considering the circumstances, Collier argued that he had only two choices, "[Perkins] must either receive it Publickly from me, or not at all."¹⁰⁴ The Church's obligation to aid the dying outweighed any other consideration. The Church set its own agenda for its ministries, not in concert with or in submission to civil authorities. Collier pressed his priestly prerogative further when he argued for the infallibility of the

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Collier, *A Defence of the Absolution*, 2.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

priest in doing his duty. Collier claimed his extraordinary powers by saying “wherever Death is in view, the Office cannot be unseasonable, nor misapplied. And can any Persons be more certain of Death than those who are publickly Condemn'd, who lie under fatal Sentence, and irresistible Power?”¹⁰⁵ Collier reinterpreted the execution of a traitor as a man being on his deathbed. In such a case, the priest’s duty was to do whatever he could to prepare the penitent for God’s judgement in the afterlife. With the spiritual authority of the presbyterate, Collier was just to act. He performed what canon law required within the time constraints of death, the ultimate necessity. Collier’s defense of necessity ignored the bishops’ complaint about political need. The role of the priest was sufficient to justify his action, regardless of fears of French invasion.

The second point Collier defended was his laying on of hands during the absolution. This act was a ritual placement of the minister’s hands upon another to impart God’s grace and authority. The bishops complained that this practice was “altogether irregular.”¹⁰⁶ Collier countered that the laying on of hands possessed Patristic precedent. Particularly, Collier appealed to the example of St. Cyprian and the fourth Council of Carthage that he oversaw. The Council’s ruling was a warrant for the use of the “Imposition of Hands” for “Penitential Absolution” by a priest in times of necessity.¹⁰⁷ However, Collier made sure to note that the priest’s authority to act in no way encroached upon the authority of the bishop, with continued reference to Cyprian.¹⁰⁸ The prayer book’s liturgy neither prescribed nor proscribed the act, therefore Collier argued that

¹⁰⁵ Jeremy Collier, *A Farther Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, Occasioned By a Paper, Entitled a Declaration of the Archbishops, and Bishops, &c.* (London, 1696), 6.

¹⁰⁶ *A Declaration*, 5.

¹⁰⁷ Collier, *A Farther Defence*, 5.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

since “Our Church has always professed a regard for the Patterns of Antiquity: We can’t do her a greater Honour, than by conforming to the Solemnities of the purest Ages.”¹⁰⁹ This qualification revealed Collier’s concern to remain consistent with Cyprian on all points. The priest had a spiritual authority that remained solely in the jurisdiction of the Church. Like other Non-Jurors, Collier’s appeal to Cyprian was to force his opponents’ hand, embarrassing them as Erastians if they rejected his argument.¹¹⁰ Collier defended the manner he performed the liturgy, according to his view that the Church was independent. The laying on of hands became a means to prove his fidelity to the Church Catholic, which depended upon a separate and independent spiritual communion.

Collier’s actions received other, though less official, attacks. Styling himself “from the Country,” a polemicist attacked Collier as an enemy of Tory principles of the Church.¹¹¹ By 1696, many prominent Tories slipped out of favor with William, having their reputations damaged in the aftermath of the Assassination Plot. For not providing the strongest justifications for William’s accession, Whigs painted Tories as crypto-Jacobites, biding their time for James’ return. Tories in Parliament, now flooded with hotheaded backbenchers, assumed the mantle of country party. They attacked the new government for degrading Parliamentary authority, waging unnecessary international war, and disconnected from the landed peoples of England. Combined with the nascent High Church faction, these Tories agitated for policies favorable to both the Church and gentry, forming a single English establishment which the crown was obliged to

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 9-10.

¹¹⁰ Rose, “By Law Established,” 33.

¹¹¹ P.H.J., *The Absolution of a Penitent, According to the Directions of the Church of England, with respect to Sir W. Perkins, Sir J. Friend, and Mr. Cranburne, lately Executed for High Treason. Against Mr Collier. In a Letter from the Country to a Friend in London* (London, 1696), 1.

support.¹¹² An appeal to a friend, whether real or imagined, as one “from the country” was an attempt to dismantle any sympathy for Collier’s actions. While the absolution may seem favorable to those irritated with William’s government, Non-Juror principles and Tory country principles were only superficially in alignment over the Church. Rather, Collier’s actions threatened the establishment of both Church and state and were the antithesis of praiseworthy.

Offering proper directions on the Church of England’s liturgy, the director, as Collier would refer to him, challenged the legitimacy of the absolution. He vituperated Collier for absolving a man who “stood sentenc’d not barely as an Instrument, but also as a Contriver, and prime Manager of the most Barbarous and Ungenerous Design of Assassinating the king in cold Blood.” The problem was not that Collier absolved Perkins, but that Perkins remained unrepentant and went to his death “without making a Publick Abhorrance of the Wickedness of the Intention, and shewing the most sincere Disposition to give Satisfaction to those he had endeavor’d to Injure.” Thus, the director concluded “here lay the Stumbling Block, that such a Man, tho’ he had done none of all this, should nevertheless, obtain so easie and so glorious an Absolution!”¹¹³ Collier had failed to exercise due diligence in his actions as a priest. The director tied a public absolution to a public performance of sorrow and repentance. He did not deny the absolution as a potent, and effective, liturgy, or the power of the priest in using it. To the contrary, he affirmed ecclesiastical spiritual power, but situated it within the concerns of

¹¹² G.V. Bennett, *The Tory Crisis in Church and State*, 47-49. W.A. Speck, *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688* (Oxford University Press, 1988), 247. Rose, *England in the 1690s*, 50-53; 92. Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 164.

¹¹³ P.H.J., *The Absolution of a Penitent*, 2.

the state. The use of the Church's office was directly connected to the needs of the civil government, not independent of them.

The director made this logic explicit by framing the absolution as rank Jacobitism. Collier may have been doing his work as a priest, but his leniency for Perkins went too far. Exasperated, the director rhetorically queried whether "compassion for such Miscreants, over-balance [sic] the Consideration of the Life of a Prince left to hazard, and the Embroiling of a Kingdom in War and Bloodshed?"¹¹⁴ Collier's public forgiveness was as good as a public endorsement of James and a French army. Contrary to any higher claim of the Church's need, the director accused Collier of fomenting rebellion and hiding behind his office. Sarcastically, he wondered whether Collier would "reduce things to their old Posture, that K. James might be replac'd in the Throne, & the Bishops in the Tower."¹¹⁵ It was no secret that Collier was a Jacobite, and a quite vocal one at that. He had already published a variety of tracts attacking pro-Revolution apologists and challenging the legality of William's reign.¹¹⁶ However, the director sought to tie this arrangement to his ecclesiology. Collier only absolved William Perkins because the priest was in full agreement with the plotter's plan to restore James. As a Jacobite, Collier was on the side of the king who locked up the Immortal Seven, and would see the Church slide back into the Roman fold. The director's ecclesiology, at least in rhetoric, required these overlapping concerns. For him, support for William was support for a Protestant Church of England. There was no differentiation between the king's theological scruples

¹¹⁴ P.H.J., *The Absolution of a Penitent*, 4.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹¹⁶ As examples of his Jacobite *bona fides*, see Jeremy Collier, *The Desertion Discuss'd In a Letter to a Country Gentleman*. (London, 1688). Jeremy Collier, *Vindiciae Juris Regii: or Remarques upon A Paper; Entituled, An Enquiry into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority*. (London, 1689).

and the Church. Ecclesiastical offices were intended to shore up the state and were linked to it in performance. Collier's actions threatened the stability of William's government and were condemned as Jacobite politics on display.

Collier responded to his critic by defending the Church's independence from the state, without qualification. Contrary to the director's assertion, that Perkins ought to have publicly repented, Collier challenged that such a requirement was alien to the Church's liturgy. The Visitation, as all liturgies in the prayer book, was a general one. Rather than the penitent publicly enumerating all of his sins, Collier argued that "Our Church does not insist upon particularities, nor make the entireness of Confession necessary to Absolution [...] the Minister is directed to examine the Sick Person, whether he repents him truly of his Sins."¹¹⁷ The priest was a competent judge to determine the sincerity of repentance. And, since Perkins' sin was already well-known, Collier was within his right to conceal any additional information that had ceased to be relevant. The priest's role was to determine the sincerity of the penitent and prepare him for death through the Church's liturgy. Laymen were not a part of this process. The ordained minister alone had authority to judge the souls of his flock, even those convicted of treason.

Ignoring the director's accusations of Jacobitism and political partisanship, Collier reframed the absolution around the independence of the Church. When his critic sought to trap Collier in violation of canon law, the Non-Juror detected a sneer. Reeling with disgust, Collier responded that "I dare not say any thing [sic] that looks like

¹¹⁷ Jeremy Collier, *A Reply to the Absolution of a Penitent, According to the Directions of the Church of England, &c.* (London, 1696), 3.

Burlesquing the Authority of the Church.” To the contrary, Collier defended his actions as befitting his ecclesiology. He proclaimed triumphantly that “I believe the Church a more Noble Society than the State: that her Original is as Divine, her Commission as Unquestioned, her Powers as Significant, and the Ends of her Institution more Important: I say more Important, as much as Time is outstretched by Eternity, and Heaven is better than an Estate, and Hell is more dreadful than the Gallows.”¹¹⁸ Against this glorious vision, Collier accused his critics of demoting the Church to a creature of politics. The dichotomy was stark: “If the Church is not *sui juris* in matters purely Spiritual, and Independent in the Exercise of the Keys, Christianity lies at the Mercy of the State, and may be extinguish’d at pleasure [...] This Divinity comes from Selden, or Erastus, or else from Hobbes’s Leviathan; and makes Religion look like a Court-invention, and a Politique Design.”¹¹⁹ The claim that his opponent was Hobbesian was a common slur. The name of Hobbes was a critic’s way to blacken an opponent who affirmed a greater role for the state in the Church’s affairs.¹²⁰ However, Collier’s deployment of this attack pushed this trope to the edge. All attempts to interfere in the Church’s self-government, even for the peace of civil society, was now Hobbesian. As a priest, Collier’s concern was for the soul of William Perkins, and he alone had authority over the man’s conscience. Rather than decrying the illegality of William’s government, or asserting that the trial was a sham, Collier ignored all accusations of Jacobitism in his actions. The absolution was about the right of the Church to arbitrate in all spiritual affairs. According

¹¹⁸ Collier, *A Reply to the Absolution of a Penitent*, 9.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹²⁰ Marshall, “The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men”, 425-426.

to this ecclesiology, Collier, as an ordained officer, was blameless in forgiving a man his sins.

Humphrey Hody joined his pen to the controversy, attacking Collier's Non-Juror ecclesiology. He divided his complaint into two parts: one ecclesiastical and the other civil. On the issue of the Church, Hody challenged the Non-Juror use of St. Cyprian. Attacking the laying on of hands, Hody complained that "a Minister of the Church of England, is not to govern himself herein by the usage of the Church of Carthage, but by his own."¹²¹ Collier was too cavalier in his authority, drawing upon a larger tradition at will. Ministers of the Church of England, Hody warned "should not make use of any but what the Church and Law amongst us do Prescribe."¹²² By law, Hody referred Collier to the Act of Uniformity, the legislation that reestablished the Church of England in the realm. Civil authority sufficiently supplied interpretations, and decisions, surrounding canon law. It was not for a priest to interpret the needs of the flock, but Parliament. Orderliness surpassed appeals to a catholic tradition. Hody's ecclesiology seamlessly melded the Church with the state, where Parliamentary authority could curb the behavior of the clergy. Hody rejected Collier's absolution because positive, Parliamentary, law, rather than Cyprianic example, was normative for the Church.

On the issue of the state, Hody accused Collier of intentionally performing Perkins' absolution in public to advocate for the Jacobite cause. Hody explained that "as

¹²¹ Humphrey Hody, *Animadversions on two pamphlets lately publish'd by Mr. Collier the one call'd, A defence of the absolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April 3d, the other, A vindication thereof, occasion'd by a paper entituled, A declaration of the sense of the achbishops [sic] and bishops, &c.: shewing the nature of the late absolution, both as to church and state: in a letter to a friend.* (London, 1696), 7.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 8.

they shew by pronouncing the Absolution, that they look upon the Fact as no Sin.”¹²³ The Non-Jurors were deploying the rites of the Church for open sedition and rebellion against William’s government. And, to an aghast Hody, Collier had the audacity to claim he was fully within his right as a priest to perform the Visitation. Against such a thinly veiled political act, Hody asked imperiously “Is there not Law, nor Canon to punish such Confessaries, as Absolve those that imbrue their hands in the Blood of Princes, and that dye without declaring any particular Repentance for what they stand condemned for, and a Repentance as open and notorious as their Crime?”¹²⁴ Perkins stood condemned for his role in the assassination plot and Collier, for participating in fraudulent repentance, was also liable. Political affairs directly impacted the Church’s authority and actions. A priest’s office was linked to the health of the realm. While Hody separated his complaint into a Church and a state point, he linked them together in a single unit that stood or fell together. Collier failed to recognize that civil law formed the parameters of the Church’s ministry, and, simultaneously, had manipulated his office for the purposes of treason. For Hody, Collier the Non-Juror was nothing more than a Jacobite and should be punished accordingly.

Collier responded to Hody through collapsing the two points of the critique, focusing his rejoinder around his right as a priest of the Church. Per the laying on of hands, there was no fault. Collier countered that Cyprian was not a lone example, but part of the “Practice General” of the Church. While the Visitation did not explicitly approve the laying on of hands, the rites of confirmation and ordination preserved the act within

¹²³ Ibid., 23.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 26.

other ecclesiastical rites. The confessor-priest was competent to apply the traditions of the Church, even when it was not prescribed. Asserting his right, Collier defended that “every priest is here left to his Liberty, both as to Office and Gesture, to Substance and Ceremony.”¹²⁵ This claim responded directly to Hody’s reference to both the canon law of the Church and the Act of Uniformity. Collier collapsed the two in defending the ordained minister’s right to decide and to act. Parliament had no power to impact the behavior of the Church regarding spiritual acts. Ignoring Parliament as a fount for the Church’s order, Collier followed other Non-Juror arguments, which understood reformation in the Church of England as Church decreed. While Parliamentary and royal power may have been instrumental in reforming the Church, these resolutions were only binding because the Church accepted them as such. For Non-Jurors, the Reformation, and by implication the Restoration, were not Erastian, and did not grant an ounce of power to the state.¹²⁶ Since all things ecclesiastical were within the power of the Church, and the Church delegated authority to its officers, Collier the priest was fit to judge spiritual matters. He explained that “we may much better collect the sense of the Rubrick by the Practice of resembling Cases. And here I alledg’d both the Antient, and our own Church, in my Defence.”¹²⁷ The ordained minister, like an ecclesiastical lawyer, sifted through the traditions of the Church Catholic, acquiring basic principles to apply to unique situations. While the Church of England had no rule respecting the exact performance of the

¹²⁵ Jeremy Collier, *An Answer to the Animadversions on two Pamphlets Lately Publish’d By Mr. Collier, &c.* (London, 1696), 9.

¹²⁶ Bisbie, *Unity of Priesthood*, 41-48; Dodwell, *A Vindication*, 32. Whether the Non-Jurors could justify England’s Reformation was a reoccurring topic. Dodwell himself dedicated a whole tract to explaining how Church independency meshed with the Church of England’s history. See Henry Dodwell, *The Doctrine of the Church of England, concerning the independency of the clergy on the lay-power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled with our oath of supremacy, and the lay-deprivations of the popish-bishops in the beginning of the Reformation* (London, 1697).

¹²⁷ Collier, *An Answer to the Animadversions*, 12.

Visitation, St. Cyprian provided a normative guide. The priest, by his office, was fully capable in mapping on the universal tradition to the local case. The spirit of Cyprian enlivened the letter of canon law.

Responding to accusations of treason, Collier defended himself according to canon law. Contrary to Hody's suspicion that the absolution was political subterfuge, Collier retorted that "the Canon obliged me not to reveal. Had I done otherwise, I had been pronounced Irregular."¹²⁸ He continued to frame the absolution as an issue of Church order, turning around the criticism from the bishops that his actions violated norms of canon law. In addition, Hody had levelled his suspicion against Collier due to public prayers. The confessor may have absolved in public, but it was a private liturgy. The Non-Jurors did not need to pray the liturgy in a way that the crowd could hear, especially if it was politically fraught. Ignoring the cry of French invasion, Collier riposted "I perceive the Animadverter is for Prayers in an unknown Language, otherwise his Expedient is impracticable."¹²⁹ Hody, like other conforming churchmen, coupled support for James with Roman Catholicism. Collier turned the critique around. If Hody wanted public ignorance of the Church's actions, he was no better than a papist who prayed exclusively in Latin. Since the vernacular was a major contention in the Reformation, Collier cast aspersions on Hody's Protestant convictions. It was Collier, maintainer of the Church's independency from civil authority, who best preserved not only the Reformation, but the greater unity of the Church Catholic. The Church had the sole right

¹²⁸ Ibid., 21.

¹²⁹ Collier, *An Answer to the Animadversions*, 22.

to declare in spiritual matters. As a priest, Collier was justified in absolving Perkins to meet his pastoral obligation.

During this war of pamphlets, Cook and Snatt had been arrested and charged with High Misdemeanor before the King's Bench in Westminster. This court only tried cases related to the king's interest, where the monarch was among the offended parties. The absolution was officially accused of being a Jacobite plot. Still avoiding authorities for the same charge, Collier published a brief pamphlet as testimony *in absentia* for his brother priests.¹³⁰ In it, Collier recapitulated the arguments with increased emphasis on canonical regularity. Since there was no specific office for the judicially condemned, he declared that "the Visitation of the Sick, which by parity of Reason is fairly applicable to the case of Persons to be Executed, who are to be consider'd as dying Men, must be used [...] unless the Ministers officiating are left to the liberty of Extemporary Effusions, which rather become a Calvinistical Elder, than a Presbyter of the Church of England."¹³¹ The priest was free within a matrix of canonical logic. He interpreted the traditions of the Church Catholic, drawing upon deeper principles to interpret gaps in the liturgy. This contrasted with a liberty to innovate at a whim, which Collier attached to dissenting practices. The issue of the absolution was "only necessity, and a defect in the Liturgy."¹³² As a priest, Collier could act for the benefit of the faithful, drawing upon the larger stream of Christian tradition to justify his actions.

¹³⁰ Boster, 79; 80, fn. 307.

¹³¹ Jeremy Collier, *The Case of the Two Absolvers that were Tryed at the Kings-Bench-Bar at Westminster, on Thursday the 2d of July 1696 For giving Absolution at the place of Execution to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkens*, (London, 1696), 2.

¹³² Collier, *The Case of the two Absolvers*, 2.

Collier also rebutted accusations of negligence in receiving Perkins' confession. Against the claim that Perkins was insufficiently sorry, Collier rejoined that "the Minister Absolving is to rest Satisfied with an account of the general Repentance of the Person to be Absolved."¹³³ If the penitent had particular sins weighing on his conscience, he was free to confess as much or as little as he deigned necessary. To ask for more was, Collier disparaged, "to plead for Auricular Confession, as 'tis taught and practiced in the Church of Rome."¹³⁴ The incrimination that Collier did not report Perkins to the government was, rather than patriotic and Protestant, to play the papist. Rather, in confusing the obligations of the Church and state, government prosecution was falling into the twin errors of popery and puritanism. Collier, in defending the integrity of his office, devoid of state interest, was in fact being true to the Protestant interest.

Jeremy Collier failed to convince his opponents, though the controversy eventually blew over. In 1697, Collier reappeared in public life, having never been arraigned or acquitted for his role in the absolution.¹³⁵ Collier remained a priest in the Non-Juror Church of England, which continued to exist into the eighteenth century. In 1713, the Non-Juror bishop George Hickes, among others, consecrated him a bishop in the Church. Collier continued to write, but he turned his attention away from politics and direct conflict with conforming churchmen. Instead, he took to stage criticism, igniting another controversy in 1698 about the immorality of the theater. Collier joined a chorus of other English ecclesiastic and moralist voices, conforming and Non-Juror, who advocated for a public reformation of manners and the transformation of English society.

¹³³ Ibid., 3.

¹³⁴ Ibid., 3.

¹³⁵ Sirota, *The Christian Monitors*, 163.

As bishop, Collier also presided over the usages crisis within the Non-Juror Church, a debate over liturgy that split the Non-Jurors further. Collier remained adamant about preserving liturgies found in Edward VI's prayer book, against conformity to eastern liturgies. His circle of influence shrank as the Non-Jurors became less and less a viable alternative to the conforming Church of England. He continued his work as bishop until his death in 1726.¹³⁶

The Non-Juror commitment to a spiritual, autonomous, Church opens a window on the development of the Church of England throughout the later Stuart period. If, as Jonathan Clark has argued, the eighteenth century was an *ancien regime*, involving a hegemonic Church-state order composed of gentry and churchmen¹³⁷, then what kind of church was the Church of England in supporting said regime? The Non-Juror case suggests a radical alternative arising from within the Church, advocating even separation from English civil society and the state. It was not proto-liberals, sceptics, or Enlighteners which showed discontent. Rather, it was malcontented traditionalists, those who adhered to a vision of a past strong enough to shake the present. The Non-Jurors offer potential to explore how impeccably orthodox churchmen might develop frustration and anger at England's *ancien regime*, threatening to disrupt the church-state in pursuit of purity. In addition, these churchmen not only battled with their pen, but through their pastorate. Liturgy, prayer, and sacrament might be used to develop and argue for a theology of discontent and separation. Pastoral practice could not only shore up the English government, but also call it into question. This study offers a launch pad for investigating

¹³⁶ Boster, 82-126.

¹³⁷ Clark, 13-20.

how Anglican Christians rejected Constantine from within the imperial Church. It was practitioners of priestcraft, not Enlightened opponents, who called this union into question.

Collier's apology for Non-Juror ecclesiology was reflected in his sentiment: "*Fiat justitia & ruat Mundus*; Better no World than no Honesty."¹³⁸ Collier was not interested in compromise, continuing to remain in the Non-Juror fold to his detriment. It is for this reason that his apology for the absolution of sir William Perkins shines a bright light on the ecclesiology of the Non-Jurors. The schism centered on whether the Church of England existed independent from the state, both Parliament and crown, as well as whether the Church was a purely spiritual entity, not one possessing rights of civil authority. The Non-Jurors answered affirmative in both cases. Unlike the growing High Church party, the Non-Jurors did not fight for the right to hand down civil sanctions. They only intended to govern affairs within the Church, which required no overlap with civil affairs. If the Church ever wielded political power, it was an accident of history, an external boon which had nothing to do with the fundamental constitutions of the Church. As the schism heated up, Non-Jurors like Collier preferred a pure and self-governing Church to a single drop of royal favor or legal establishment. Thus, absolving William Perkins, a faithful penitent, outweighed all political needs. The Non-Juror Church not only undermined the legitimacy of William's regime, but threatened the concomitant Church-State which placed it in power.

¹³⁸ Collier, *Case of Allegiance*, 139.

Works Cited

Primary Sources

- A Declaration of the Sense of the Archbishops, and Bishops, Now in and about London, upon the Occasion of their Attendance in Parliament, Concerning the Irregular and Scandalous Proceedings of certain Clergiemen, at the Execution of Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkins.* London, 1696.
- The Book of Common Prayer*, Cambridge University Press, (1662) 2003.
- Bisbie, Nathaniel. *Unity of Priesthood Necessary to the Unity of Communion in a Church, With some Reflections on the Oxford Manuscript and the Preface annexed. Also Collections of Canons, part of the said Manuscript, faithfully translated into English from the Original, but concealed by Mr. Hody, and his Prefacer.* London, 1692.
- Collier, Jeremy. *The Office of a Chaplain Equir'd into, and Vindicated from Servility and Contempt.* London, 1688.
- Collier, Jeremy. *The Desertion Discuss'd In a Letter to a Country Gentleman.* London, 1688.
- Collier, Jeremy. *Vindiciae Juris Regii: or Remarques upon A Paper; Entitled, An Equiry into the Measures of Submission to the Supream Authority.* London, 1689.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Caution against inconsistency, or, The connexion between praying and swearing in relation to the civil powers.* London, 1690.
- Collier, Jeremy. *Dr. Sherlock's Case of Allegiance Considered with some remarks upon his Vindication.* London, 1691.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Brief Essay concerning the Independency of Church-Power.* London, 1692.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, At the Place of Execution. April the 3d., With a Farther Vindication thereof, Occasioned by a Paper, Entitled a Declaration of the Sense of Arch-Bishops and Bishops, &c.* London, 1696.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Farther Defence of the Absolution given to Sr. William Perkins, Occasioned By a Paper, Entitled a Declaration of the Archbishops, and Bishops, &c.* London, 1696.
- Collier, Jeremy. *A Reply to the Absolution of a Penitent, According to the Directions of the Church of England, &c.* London, 1696.
- Collier, Jeremy. *An Answer to the Animadversions on two Pamphlets Lately Publish'd By Mr. Collier, &c.* London, 1696.
- Collier, Jeremy. *The Case of the Two Absolvers that were Tryed at the Kings-Bench-Bar at Westminster, on Thursday the 2d of July 1696 For giving Absolution at the place of Execution to Sir John Friend and Sir William Parkens.* London, 1696.
- Dodwell, Henry. *A Vindication of the deprived Bishops, asserting their spiritual rights against a lay deprivation, against the charge of schism, as managed by the late editors of an anonymous Baroccian ms in two parts...to which is subjoined the latter end of the said ms. omitted by the editors, making against them and the cause espoused by them, in Greek and English.* London, 1692.
- Dodwell, Henry. *The Doctrine of the Church of England, concerning the independency of the clergy on the lay-power, as to those rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled*

- with our oath of supremacy, and the lay-deprivations of the popish-bishops in the beginning of the Reformation.* London, 1697.
- Hody, Humphrey. *The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the New Bishops Or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, Shewing, That although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither He nor the Church ever made a Separation; if the Successor was not a Heretic.* London, 1691.
- Hody, Humphrey. *Animadversions on two pamphlets lately publish'd by Mr. Collier the one call'd, A defence of the absolution given to Sir William Parkins at the place of execution, April 3d, the other, A vindication thereof, occasion'd by a paper entituled, A declaration of the sense of the archbishops [sic] and bishops, &c. : shewing the nature of the late absolution, both as to church and state: in a letter to a friend.* London, 1696.
- P.H.J. *The Absolution of a Penitent, According to the Directions of the Church of England, with respect to Sir W. Perkins, Sir J. Friend, and Mr. Cranburne, lately Executed for High Treason. Against Mr Collier. In a Letter from the Country to a Friend in London.* London, 1696.
- Sherlock, William. *The Case of the Allegiance due to sovereign powers, defended, &c.* London, 1691.
- Stillingfleet, Edward. *Irenicum; A Weapon Salve for the Church's Wounds; or the Divine Right of Particular Forms of Church Government.* 2nd Ed. London, 1662.
- Stillingfleet, Edward. *The Mischief of Separation: A Sermon Preached at Guild-Hall Chappel, May II. MDCLXXX Being the First Sunday in Easter-Term, Before the Lord Mayor, &c.* London, 1680.
- Stillingfleet, Edward *The Unreasonableness of Separation, or, An impartial account of the history, nature, and pleas of the present separation from the communion of the Church of England to which, several late letters are annexed, of eminent Protestant divines abroad, concerning the nature of our differences, and the way to compose them.* London, 1681.
- Stillingfleet, Edward *A Vindication OF Their Majesties Authority To Fill The Sees of the Deprived Bishops in a letter out of the country occasioned by Dr. B—'s refusal of the bishoprick of Bath and Wells.* London, 1691.

Secondary Sources

- Bennett, G.V. "Conflict in the Church." In *Britain after the Glorious Revolution, 1689-1714*, Edited by Geoffrey Holmes. Bungay, Suffolk: Macmillan and Co., 1969.
- Bennett, G.V. *The Tory Crisis in Church and State, 1688-1730: The career of Francis Atterbury, Bishop of Rochester.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1975.
- Boster, Tania. "'Better to be alone than in ill company': Jeremy Collier the Younger: Life and Works, 1650-1726." PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2008.
- Broxap, Henry. *The Later Non-Jurors.* Cambridge University Press, 1924.
- Bulman, William J. *Anglican Enlightenment: Orientalism, Religion and Politics in England and its Empire, 1648-1715.* Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Champion, J.A.I. *The Pillars of Priestcraft Shaken: The Church of England and its Enemies, 1660-1730.* Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Clark, J.C.D. *English Society 1660-1832: Religion, ideology, and politics during the ancient regime.* 2nd Ed. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Claydon, Tony. *William III and the Godly Revolution.* Cambridge University Press, 1996.

- Claydon, Tony. *Europe and the Making of England, 1660-1760*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- Cornwall, Robert D. *Visible and Apostolic: The Constitution of the Church in High Church Anglican and Non-Juror Thought*. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1993.
- Every, George. *The High Church Party, 1688-1718*. London: SPCK, 1956.
- Findon, John C. "The NonJurors and the Church of England, 1689-1716." DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 1976.
- Garrett, Jane. *The Triumphs of Providence: The Assassination Plot, 1696*. Cambridge University Press, 1980.
- Goldie, Mark. "The Nonjurors, Episcopacy, and the Origins of the Convocation Controversy." In *Ideology and Conspiracy: Aspects of Jacobitism, 1689-1759*, Edited by Eveline Cruickshanks. Edinburgh: John Donald Publishers, 1982.
- Ed. Goldie, Mark. *The entring book of Roger Morrice, 1677-1691, I: Roger Morrice and the Puritan Whigs*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press, 2007.
- Haugen, Kristine Louise. *Richard Bentley: Poetry and Enlightenment*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Hawkins, L.M. *Allegiance in Church and State: The Problem of the Nonjurors in the English Revolution*. London: Routledge, 1928.
- Hopes, J. "Politics and Morality in the Writings of Jeremy Collier." *Literature and History* 8 (1978): 159-174.
- Horwitz, Henry. *Parliament, Policy and Politics in the reign of William III*. Manchester University Press, 1977.
- Hylson-Smith, Kenneth. *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993.
- Leighton, C.D.A. "Ancienneté among the Non-Jurors: a study of Henry Dodwell." *History of European Ideas*, Vol. 31 (2005): 1-16.
- Levine, Joseph M. *Between the Ancients and the Moderns: Baroque Culture in Restoration England*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Locke, Kenneth A. *The Church in Anglican Theology: A Historical, Theological and Ecumenical Exploration*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2009.
- Marshall, John. "The Ecclesiology of the Latitude-men 1660-1689: Stillingfleet, Tillotson, and 'Hobbism'." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 36, No. 3 (1985): 407-427.
- Murphy, Andrew R. *Conscience and Community: Revisiting Toleration and Religious Dissent in Early Modern England and America*. University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2001.
- Overton, J.H. *The Non-Jurors: Their Lives, Principles, and Writings*. London: Smith, Elder, & Co., 1902.
- Padley, Kenneth. "Rendering unto Caesar in the Age of Revolution: William Sherlock and William of Orange." *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, Vol. 59, No. 4 (2008): 680-696.
- Pincus, Steven. *1688: The First Modern Revolution*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2011.
- Quantin, Jean-Louis. *The Church of England and Christian Antiquity: The Construction of a Confessional Identity in the 17th Century*. Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Rose, Craig. *England in the 1690s: Revolution, Religion and War*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

- Rose, Jacqueline. *Godly Kingship in Restoration England: The Politics of the Royal Supremacy, 1660-1668*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Rose, Jacqueline. "'By law established': The Church of England and the royal supremacy." In *The later Stuart Church, 1660-1714*, Edited by Grant Tapsell. Manchester University Press, 2012.
- Rupp, Gordon. *Religion in England, 1688-1791*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1986.
- Sewell Jr., William H. *The Logics of History: Social Theory and Social Transformation*. University of Chicago, 2005.
- Sirota, Brent S. "'The Leviathan Is Not Safely to Be Angered': The Convocation Controversy, and Anglican High Churchmanship, 1689-1702." In *Religion and the State: Europe and North America in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, Edited by Joshua B. Stein and Sargon G. Donabed. Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2012.
- Sirota, Brent S. "The Trinitarian Crisis in Church and State: Religious Controversy and the Making of the Post-revolutionary Church of England, 1687-1702." *Journal of British Studies*, vol. 52, (January 2013): 26-54.
- Sirota, Brent S. *The Christian Monitors: The Church of England and the Age of Benevolence, 1680-1730*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Speck, W.A. *Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688*. Oxford University Press, 1988.
- Spurr, John. "The Church of England, Comprehension, and the Toleration Act of 1689." *The English Historical Review*, vol. 54, issue 413 (1989): 927-946.
- Spurr, John. "'Virtue, Religion and Government': The Anglican use of Providence." In *The Politics of Religion in Restoration England*, edited by Tim Harris, Paul Seaward, and Mark Goldie. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990.
- Spurr, John. *The Restoration Church of England, 1646-1689*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Starkie, Andrew. "Contested Histories of the English Church: Gilbert Burnet and Jeremy Collier." *Huntington Library Quarterly* 68 (2005): 335-351.
- Sykes, Norman. *From Sheldon to Secker: Aspects of English Church History, 1660-1768*. Cambridge University Press, 1959.
- Wand, J.C. *The High Church Schism*. London: The Faith Press, 1951.
- Weil, Rachel. *A Plague of Informers: Conspiracy and Political Trust in William III's England*. New Haven, CT.: Yale University Press, 2013.
- Yould, Guy Martin. "The Origins and Transformation of the Non-Juror Schism, 1670-1715; Illustrated by Special Reference to the Career, Writings and Activities of Dr. George Hickes, 1642-1715." DPhil thesis, University of Hull, 1979.

Education:

- Ph.D., 2015-, Lehigh University; Anglo-American and Atlantic World History, In Process.
- 2018, M.A. Thesis: “The Sword of St. Peter: Jeremy Collier and the Development of Non-Juror Ecclesiology, 1662-1696,” Advisor: Dr. William J. Bulman; Second Reader: Dr. Michelle LeMaster.
- B.A., 2010-2014, Lafayette College; History & Classical Civilization.
- Magna Cum Laude.

Teaching/Work Experience

- Spring 2018, Lehigh University, Teaching Assistant in ‘The History of Modern Medicine,’ working with Dr. John Smith.
- Fall 2017, Lehigh University, Guest Lecturer, “Thomas Hobbes and the Emergence of the Sovereign in *Leviathan* and *Behemoth*.”
- Fall 2017, Lehigh University, Guest Lecturer, “The Place of Majoritarian Democracy within Medieval Christendom.”
- Fall 2017, Lehigh University, Teaching Assistant in ‘The Rise and Fall of Democracy,’ working with Dr. William J. Bulman.
- Summer-Fall 2017, Lehigh University, Researching Assistant, working with Dr. William J. Bulman.
- Spring 2017, Lehigh University, Teaching Assistant in ‘United States, 1865-1941,’ working with Dr. Kimberly Carrell-Smith.
- Fall 2016, Lehigh University, Teaching Assistant in ‘Greek History,’ working with Dr. Michael Clark.
- Fall 2016, Lehigh University, Guest Lecturer, “Aristophanes’ *The Birds* and Athenian Imperialism in the Peloponnesian War.”
- 2012-2013, Lafayette College, Editing Assistant for *Gnomon: Critical Journal of the Entire Field of Scholarship on Classical Antiquity*, with Dr. Markus Dubischar.
- 2012, Lafayette College, Excel Research Assistant, working with Dr. Markus Dubischar on Sophocles, Greek Tragedy, and *Antigone*.
- 2012-2013, Lafayette College, Tutor, Elementary Latin.

Fellowships/Awards:

- 2018, Lehigh University; College of Arts and Sciences Summer Research Fellowship
- 2016-2018, Lehigh University; History Department Teaching Assistantship.
- 2015-2016, Lehigh University; Presidential Fellowship.
- 2014, Lafayette College; George H. Catlin Prize in Classical Studies.
- 2014, Lafayette College; Inducted into Alpha Phi Alpha Historical Honors Society.
- 2014, Lafayette College; Inducted into Phi Beta Kappa Honors Society.

Skills/Activities:

- Reading Languages: Latin.

- Reading/Speaking Language: Modern Hebrew.
- Reading Languages (limited): Attic Greek.
- Computer Skills: Microsoft PowerPoint, Microsoft Excel, Java (limited), Optical Character Recognition software
- Editing, Grading, Writing, Leading Discussions.

Additional Interests:

- Patristic Theology, Philosophy of Mind, Soccer, Film Criticism, Biblical Studies, Poker.